THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is a tension in modern thought and life between those who dismiss or dilute the idea of the Divine and those who on the other hand regard the human element as both hopeless and ultimately negligible. Is this sort of dualism or conflict necessary? This is the question which is debated at length in the recently published Croall Lectures, entitled *Humanism and Christianity*,[1] which were delivered in 1938–39 at Edinburgh University by W. S. URQUHART, D.D., D.L., LL.D., Emeritus Principal of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta.

It is the author's thesis that the solving word lies in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. That doctrine requires to be, and is capable of being, worked out religiously and philosophically in such a way as to overcome this conflict between naturalistic-humanistic and transcendental schools of thought. For eternity must work in and through time, and supremely in Christ human nature has been honoured as a vehicle of the eternal. For any fully balanced estimate and unification of human experience we must follow this clue. The results of the Incarnation in its satisfactions for thought and practice justify us in proclaiming it as 'the open secret of the universe.'

In this attempt Dr. URQUHART finds himself obliged to fight on two fronts, an arduous business in any field. According to him, the modern world has felt tremendously the impact of rationalism and science, and, with the materialistic bias this engendered, religious faith tended to be assigned to the realm of poetry and imagination. Can nothing that is religiously valuable be salvaged from this debacle? There are various answers of an affirmative kind by the Science of Psychology, by Humanism, by Naturalistic Religion. On various levels these are attempts at recognition of spirituality, and as such offer man deliverance. But it is the contention of the author that the recognition evaporates the notion of the Divine of true objectivity, and that there is no salvation 'proper to a man' in a God who is simply another name for our own ideals or the hidden mysterious and sometimes gracious potencies of Nature. The 'natural piety' proclaimed by so many forms of pragmatic culture has no ultimate defence against pride or decadence. The God here salvaged for human service is smothered in temporality.

Does it fare better with the transcendentalists? The larger section of Dr. URQUHART's book faces this as it is presented in the Barthian theology. Here indeed is real objectivity. Religion acknowledges the Other, the Living God, Lord of Time and Change; and man is given hope, but a hope which, while always rejoicing, definitely acknowledges the fruitlessness of the human quest. We commend to students of theology the patient and appreciative exploration Dr. URQUHART makes into the negative and positive principles that control this theological approach to Christianity and the human predicament. The exposition is laborious but very informative. The author however rejects firmly this transcendentalism as an adequate rendering of Incarnation doctrine. The difference between Divine and human is carried to extreme and contradictory lengths. We would draw attention to the important chapter (ix.) on 'The Religious Capacity of Man, and the Relation of Christianity to Other Religions.' 'It is impossible,' he says, 'for Barth to carry through the doctrine that the Imago Dei in man is wholly lost . . . and the followers of Barth are equally embarrassed.' Dr. URQUHART's specialized knowledge of Eastern religions lends great weight to his judgment upon this theology and other religions. 'Barth's attitude,' he concludes, 'would be justifiable over against a position such as that of Troeltsch'; but the principle that uniqueness and universality are contradictory to each other must be opposed not only on Biblical grounds, but on the actualities of missionary experience. 'Christianity is not an exclusive but a distinctive expression of God.'

In his apologetic for a more balanced interpretation of the Christian message, and a deeper understanding of human nature 'as bound and respondent to Godhead,' Dr. URQUHART has much interesting material he draws from his knowledge of Indian faiths. The form which the tension

[1] T. & T. Clark; 11s. net.

between the material and the spiritual assumed in Indian thought has devoted to it one of the longest chapters (v.) in the book. Recently in a book on 'Indian and Western Philosophy' Dr. Betty Heimann argued that the main tendency in Indian thought is pluralistic, not monistic; the variegated polytheism of India needs no explanation; the emphasis upon unity is something not derived from the East, but what Western thought has imposed on it. Indian religions therefore are forms of salvation by abandonment to the hidden, inexhaustible forces of Nature. Its exuberance is of the Dionysiac kind. To this view Dr. URQUHART will not consent, and in consequence he is led to an absorbing and richly documented discussion of both the idea of *negation* and the idea of *identity* which are structural in Indian religious literature, and revelations of a persistent monism. In spite of the difficulty of the topic, this chapter is in many ways the clearest and the most rewarding in the book. We might mention here something Dr. URQUHART says later, and over which doubtless Dr. Barth would smile. He makes many references to the great commentator on the *Vedanta Sutras*, Sankara, and finds an extraordinary similarity between Barth's despair of the human soul and that which is found in the Vedas generally, and especially in Sankara. 'Indeed, the resemblance is so striking that one is tempted to say that, if Barth could give even momentary assent to the doctrine of transmigration, and if he could give serious consideration to the writings of Sankara, he would be compelled to regard himself as in many respects a reincarnation of the Vedantist teacher!' A humorous but shrewd thrust!

What is wanted then is such a presentation of Christianity as will assist in eliciting the elements of value in other faiths and spiritual enterprises of the human soul, without yielding to the weakness of syncretism or diminishing our trust in the final character of the revelation through Christ. Indeed, Christianity can enter with religious interest into the *necessity* which science is seeking to explore; it can enrich the *freedom* which humanism has tended to make self-sufficient; and this it can do through that *grace* of God which Barthianism indeed exalts but at the expense of almost making it another kind of determinism.

His readers would have liked if Dr. URQUHART had found room for a more positive exposition of the synthesis he has in view. The critical battle on two fronts has hindered him in this task, though his last two chapters endeavour it. What does the Higher Humanism which Christianity can sustain and bless involve for our Christology? This is really a difficult question, and the categories and language of the ancient creeds leave the modern mind unsatisfied. Perhaps Christology in the ancient sense is not possible at all, or necessary. In any case the direction in which Dr. URQUHART would look on this issue is surely right and hopeful. We cannot do better than quote as indicative of his quest this passage from his concluding section. 'In all our endeavours towards reverent thinking of the significance of the Incarnation of Christ, is it not possible to begin, not with two natures but with two directions of love—love towards God in all its fullness, and also in its fullness love towards man? Perhaps the practical may come more and more to influence the theoretical interpretation not merely in a pragmatic sense, but in a revelatory manner. It may be that it is to this attitude we are specially called in this age . . . in which we have primarily to do, not with opposing theological doctrines, but with antithetic attitudes to life.'

In a somewhat remarkable book, *Prospect for Christendom: Essays in Catholic Social Reconstruction*, edited by Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt,[1] there is an interesting chapter towards the close entitled 'The Forces against Us.' It is written by the Canon of Ely, the Rev. Henry BALMFORTH, and the aim is to elucidate some of the major obstacles which have to be faced and overcome if our social order is to be set on a Christian foundation. These obstacles are to be found not only in the world but in the Church, and honest investigation imposes the distasteful task of inquiring where the Christian folk themselves, by sins whether of commission or of omission, by ignorance, inefficiency, or mere laziness and feebleness, are making it harder to translate into practice the ideals of Christendom.

St. Paul put the general theme of this essay broadly in the first chapter of Romans, and his language can be put in a modern idiom if we say that a civilization that flouts God is bound to come to grief, because the structure of the universe is such that only in obedience to the divine will can any ordering of human life be maintained in health. In whatsoever degree men choose to forget their creatureliness and their dependence, and seek to organize life as though they were self-sufficient masters of their world, they fail in the purpose of their being and inevitably fall into frustration.

That is a general statement. But, coming to

[1] Faber & Faber; 12s. 6d. net.

particulars, Canon BALMFORTH points to the fact as indisputable that our civilization is corrupt. How corrupt it is we see by the crisis in which we find ourselves. It is no naïve patriotism that places the immediate responsibility for this disaster on the evil will of a few men and on the immoral docility that accepted the yoke of these men. But the Nazi abomination does not stand a lonely island of wickedness in a sea of righteousness. It is only the end-product of a system in which the whole Western culture has been implicated, and of a scale of values which has imposed itself on the general pattern of modern life. We have been acquiescing in, and welcoming, a false view of life. As in the early Roman Empire of St. Paul's day, a corrupt world is a world with a perverted scale of values.

The author then analyses this corruption for us. There are three things in it. First, the objective of human life has been misconstrued. Man, the child of God and the pilgrim of eternity, has been perverted into 'economic man,' and the deepest centres of his spiritual nature have been starved. Secondly, international anarchy, which makes the human race the miserable victim of predatory lusts and denies the elementary laws of morality in all the larger relationships of men, has nullified the solidarity and mutual dependence of men and nations. Thirdly, there is the major modern heresy which turns man the creature, wholly dependent upon God, into self-sufficient man exploiting the world of Nature for his own satisfaction. The idols of human power, economic, military, imperialistic, propagandist, become the substitutes for Almighty God.

It is this that makes Christian reconstruction, which is imperative, so difficult. It is this perverted scale of values that creates a formidable mass of obstacles, material and psychological, on the way towards reconstruction. What are these obstacles? One is due to the breakdown of the mediæval system, with its professed ideal of a Christian society. Owing to that breakdown, religion, instead of being the principle of all human life, political and economic, was relegated to private life, and the characteristic achievements of post-Renaissance Christianity, Catholic and Protestant alike, have been in the fields of the interior life, philanthropy and missionary enterprise.

More is said of that in another connexion later; so it may be left undeveloped here. Another obstacle of a different kind, however, which Christianity has to surmount, actually flows from the individualizing of religion. It is the consequent place given to the State. In a world in which the social values are not related to religion the State takes on the functions of Providence. Only the State has the resources to provide for education, health services, the relief of the unemployed and the aged in the crowded urbanized populations of the modern world. The growth of the Socialist and Labour movement, and the humanitarian revolt against the cruelties and human wastage of industrialism helped the State's monopolizing of power.

The advantages of this State action are obvious and the benefits it has bestowed. But there is a real danger in the place the State thus obtains, the danger that it may become totalitarian in a community that is predominantly secular in its outlook. The peril of the God-state is real enough when the ruling motive is to seek economic security, and the good life for man is interpreted as secular prosperity. The State takes the place of Providence, since it provides what men really want. The State ceases to be the political organ of the community and becomes the master of men's lives in all departments. In the heat of war we have sworn brave oaths that this will never happen here. But the drift towards Totalitarianism is not necessarily bound up with the despotic rule of the party. It can consort with the forms of parliamentary democracy. And when men find all their well-being within the four corners of a State-controlled economic prosperity they are in principle atheist and totalitarian.

It is out of this situation that the Church's chief practical difficulty arises. This can be stated in a sentence. Christianity talks a language and handles a set of ideas that seem meaningless or irrelevant to large numbers of our contemporaries who have no sense of sin or of spiritual need and for whom man is entirely self-sufficient. One would think that the sense of frustration and inadequacy which is widespread would alter this standpoint. But, as Niebuhr points out, 'No accumulation of contradictory evidence seems to disturb modern man's good opinion of himself.' Education does little or nothing to eradicate this opinion, and any evils that are patent are, according to the modern man, due to corrupting institutions which he is going to destroy.

And what of the obstacles *within* the Church? The author has a good deal to say of this, which can only be briefly indicated. One obstacle is the tendency, already alluded to, to make religion an

individual affair. This is obvious in evangelical pietism, but it exists all over Christendom in the conception that religion is something less than the whole of life. This is not only a declension from a time when the social implications of Christianity were plainly recognized, but (according to Canon Balmforth) it is in plain contradiction to the teaching of the New Testament. An effort is sometimes made to by-pass the main problem here and to satisfy ourselves and others by the suggestion that we ought to bring a 'Christian spirit' into public and business life. This is a compromise with the urgent truth and duty of social righteousness, and cannot be regarded as satisfying.

The author has some pungent remarks to make on the defects of Church organization and finance and on the use and training of the clergy. 'Many clergymen are ill-read in theology, inexpert in the work of the physician of souls, poor preachers and worse teachers, and even unhandy and untrained in the art of public worship. The priesthood means everything to them, but they are aware that their training in the work of a priest has never been satisfactory.' This is an honest statement that one of the obstacles to the Christian reconstruction of our country is the inefficiency of the ministers of religion. But what of the laity? The power of the Church to commend a Christian order of society to the nation will depend mainly upon the leavening influence of the Christian laity. No reform in the machinery of Church organization, no improvement in the pastoral and evangelistic efficiency of the clergy, can relieve the laity of their responsibility for bringing Christian values into the common life. Nothing very much is said as to whether the laity are sensible of this responsibility, but it is hinted that here also, as in the case of the clergy, much remains to be bettered.

Such are some of the points in this interesting essay. We may close this review of them with the author's own summary. 'Three major threats to human welfare, as Christians understand it, have presented themselves. There is the danger of a purely this-world, biological or bio-chemical, conception of man, which makes Christianity irrelevant and meaningless. There is the danger of a servile organization of social life, a well-ordered authoritarianism which starves the soul while it regiments the whole social and economic behaviour of man. And there is the danger of a side-tracking of religion, which makes it wholly inorganic to society, if it does not directly oppose it as a foreign body in the social machine.'

The New Order.

XV. Educational Planning: The Need for a Christian Sociology.

By Professor W. Fraser Mitchell, Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

It cannot be denied that the bulk of the education which has had official support in England in the last forty years has been of a kind which encouraged self-expression, the seeking of personal satisfactions, and conformity to a conventional morality as recognized by one's immediate community. The third factor has been the governing one of the triad, and self-expression and personal ambition have tended to be determined by their relation to the likely approval of particular social groups. Such apparent liberty, as Dewey demonstrates in his essay 'Authority and Social Change,' has tended to become a purely economic tyranny from which mankind can only be delivered by recognizing that liberty is not freedom from authority, but that freedom and authority stand to each other in an organic relationship—that to be truly free individuals must have found and accepted an authority whose claims they regard as absolute. Dewey's analysis of how historically man lost faith in and gradually became hostile to authority, is valuable, but when he attempts to find an authority, neither traditional nor supernatural, which our contemporaries might accept, his argument ends inconclusively in the hope that as there has grown up a general body of scientific opinion which is accepted universally, so there may come to be a generally accepted body of organized social opinion.

This conclusion, however, although less dogmatic than the claims put forward by many educational planners, if it is to be made practicable, must be reduced to stages of steadily realizable achievement, since the state of world affairs will no longer permit of such a gradual evolution of opinion. Fortunately we are not confined to Dewey's conclusion from his given premises. His positing of the relation of freedom and authority

is excellent; his rejection of the supernatural a matter for debate. If we are prepared to recognize Christianity as supplying a valid authority then we have at hand an alternative to Planning which at one and the same time assures us of being in contact with Ultimate Reality and guarantees to each—even enjoins upon each—the fullest possible exertion of his various powers as a condition of the relationship in which he stands to what is absolute. Only by this acceptance, be it noted, are we following out adequately the sociological tendency of our times; for, Christianity, as Barth would remind us, is the completed sociology of the whole man; or, as he would prefer to say, it is the sociology of the renewed man who has become aware of his standing in Christ, and who henceforth must affirm over against the purely naturalistic processes of human society the values implicit in his recognition of this relationship.

The three main notes of a true Christianity are Liberty, Recognition of Obligation, and Co-operation. The Christian is set free from fear of the Unknown (whether conceived as God or no-God), from fear of a hostile universe, and from fear of self. He recognizes himself as belonging to Another—as being 'under authority'—as under obligation to serve his Master's ends and to proclaim these as they are revealed to him. Finally, he, and all men so actuated, spontaneously co-operate to achieve such ends.

Planning must involve for many new fear, because it implies limitations and a secular direction of life which may conflict with obligation to the Master of Life. Nor can we find a solution to this dilemma by delimiting the spheres in which individual liberty and social compulsion are to operate. Germany provides an instructive example of such division of spheres of influence which has proved disastrous to the religious and political life of the nation. Neither Christ nor St. Paul directly challenged slavery as an institution, yet the general feeling of Christians has been that slavery is incompatible with a man's standing in Christ. A slave might have liberty for communion with God, might even have opportunity to live a very full Christian life; but he had not freedom to fulfil his obligations to God as he might at any moment recognize these. Similarly a planned society might remove from men many evils and many temptations. So does the *Index expurgatorum*. So did the Puritan closing of the theatres. But such action does not make for growth in character. Milton's plea as put forth in the *Areopagitica* remains valid: if men are to be virtuous they must be free to choose wrongly. *Better* educated men and women are not enough. What are needed are *right* educated men and women, where *right* is determined with reference to the revealed Will of God. Improved scientific education has given us the enlarged horrors of the present war; and the warning of Sir J. Alfred Ewing in his Presidential Address to the British Association remains: unless man can make a commensurate or greater advance in morality than in science, scientific invention by outstripping the moral sense of humanity will end by destroying mankind.

An improved morality, however, by itself will prove insufficient. The shifting of Planning from knowledge and skill to morals and behaviour will not save us. Soviet 'planned' morality has done wonders, as the twelfth chapter of the Webbs' book, Ella Winter's *Red Virtue* (the record of this new morality), and Beatrice King's *Changing Man* all show. But social virtue has no absolute guarantee. Any individual may question why he ought to conform to it. Man is, indeed, 'a social animal,' but too little attention has been paid to one of his fundamental characteristics—his conviction that he has a 'right' to contract out of society, which if analysed, means his conviction that under certain circumstances he has the 'duty' to contract out of society. This is for the moment an unpopular doctrine, but, psychologically, it lies behind our interest in 'Robinson Crusoe,' 'Emile' and the hero of Butler's *Erewhon*. We are profoundly interested in a solitary man up against odds and in a novel situation, and we are so because we recognize that at some moment we ourselves may be in such a position. This is not a racial memory of the predicament which W. P. Ker regarded as typical of early Teutonic literature; it is rather a premonition of the potential prophetic element in each of us.

Ability to endure solitariness (which Sir Ernest Barker ranks high among the Calvinistic virtues that have gone to the establishment of the British Commonwealth) may be due either to egotism or to a strong sense of the presence and power of God. The latter includes more than at first sight appears. In the consciousness of Jesus, God is not thought of as 'the Alone'; He has the holy angels with Him; He is the Lord of many mansions. And already in the Apocalypse of St. John something of the multitudinous fullness of Dante's vision is adumbrated, and Heaven is presented as a great society actively engaged in worship of God and service of man.

Hence, contracting out of human society is fundamentally a recognition that we are social beings of a peculiar sort—that we possess a status as members of another society the validity of whose claims upon us is such as to override our obedience to any human society. Moreover, human society derives its only worth from its

relation to this other society. The heavenly society is a Realm of Ends an order in which values reign supreme, not, as Rupert Brooke thought, because

> Our melting flesh fixed Beauty there a star,
> And perishing hearts, imperishable Love ;

or because, as Whitehead holds, it represents a depository of constantly evolving human values ; but because it is itself Reality, and man can only understand his own nature and what should be the structure of human society by what is revealed to him of this higher order.

Against the ' Babylonian towers ' of mere world orders some Continental religious thinkers feel a need for declaring the ' wholly otherness ' of this order. Theirs is to some extent a revival of the conception of mediæval educationists who sought to educate men primarily for eternal life in the next world. But to the degree to which individuals are changed by contact with Christ and become ' new creatures ' they are bringing the ' new creation ' into vital relation with the life of our times. It is of this fact that St. Paul reminds us when he speaks of Christians as citizens of Heaven, *i.e.* colonists, possessing a culture and code of morals, sent out, as it were, from this divine order to found communities—' cells,' pockets of influence—in this world where we ought to reproduce its values. If this be so, then the function and aim of education is not to encourage men to cultivate their spiritual possibilities in a way which ignores concrete worldly problems, but to ensure that men and women, young and old, are so saturated with experience of the divine order that they will henceforth live and work in the world, whether in this land or in any land, as missionaries and exponents of that order. To speak thus is not to take refuge in wishful thinking or in airy idealism. It is to be severely practical. But our practice—social and educational—must be based on the realities of that order which has been revealed to us, and this revelation is itself a touchstone by which we may test all human institutions and proposals.

By far the most important principle that requires to be proclaimed in education is that education is the organized means of assisting both young and old to a fuller experience of the reality of God, and to such knowledge, skill and appreciation as may best fit them to serve His purpose now and eternally. If to some ears this may sound suspiciously like the opening of the ' Shorter Catechism,' Dr. J. W. Oliver provides us (in *Man's Chief End*) with a complete justification for the resemblance :

> ' We may dodge and twist and hide our heads in the sand and stop our ears with cotton-wool, but we cannot escape from a voice that demands with crude and violent insistence : " What is the chief end of Man ? " '

However much we may try to avoid answering, Education must sooner or later face up to this question.

It may be argued that to talk of ' organizing ' means implies Planning. To some extent it does. We must budget financially and arrange practically for the different laps of schooling or supplementary education, and bring to bear upon young and old as many of the best influences we are agreed upon as we can. Moreover, a main aim of such education will definitely be concerned with the world's work and our service of our fellows. But the extent of such Planning and its objectives will be clearly defined by their relation to the experience of God as the central reality.

Almost the gravest danger, at present, is that religious knowledge should take the place of a truly religious education. Permission to offer religious knowledge as a subject for examination, and the making of this subject a possible qualification for intending teachers, will increase this tendency. The corporate act of worship, it is notorious, is of doubtful and variable value in making real to the young genuine religious experience, and it remains often wholly unconnected with the rest of a school or Youth Club's activities. The alternative to Planning, the reality in the light of which Planning is exposed to criticism, is, as we have seen, an experience which if lived out in all its implications should produce a changed human consciousness, possessing which mankind can make a new approach to all problems. This ' new order of consciousness,' Mr. Middleton Murry claims, in his *Life of Jesus*, would be ' as different from that which men now have, as human life and human consciousness is different from animal life and animal consciousness.' Moreover, Barth's very insistence on God as ' Wholly Other ' to man draws attention forcefully to the gap that exists between the divine attitude and human attitudes, and to the radical change to which we must submit if we would range ourselves on the side of the Kingdom of God and its values. Even if we prefer to dwell on the thought of ' that of God ' which is ' in every man,' we must acknowledge that there is an ' otherliness ' in *that* which first separates us drastically from the life of our time and then lays us under a compulsion to assist our contemporaries to a clearer understanding of themselves and of God's purpose for them.

It is good also that Barth should remind us that ' we are not unofficial observers of the action of God in the world ' ; that ' when we find ourselves in God, we find ourselves committed to the task of affirming Him in the world as it is and not in a false transcendent world of dream.'

Even if Barth would criticise adversely the 'social gospel' which in Britain and America has tended to be substituted for the sheer re-orientation of individuals which he holds fundamental to Christianity, he is at one with Professor MacMurray and those who in facing the challenge of Communism and examining its implications for Christians, emphasize (as he does in *The Word of God and the Word of Man*) that redeemed man has a duty to society and to culture. It is the same fact to which we find Mr. C. S. Lewis pointing (in *Christian Behaviour* and elsewhere): Christianity is not a substitute for the learning of languages, or the study of economics, or for political wisdom; it is a new way of looking at life which does not free men from problems but gives men a new outlook and energy with which to tackle their problems.

Applied to Education the challenge these writers throw down to us may be stated as follows: Is Education to recognize the existence and possibility of this new consciousness? Is it prepared to adjust its procedures with due regard to existing religious experience and in a way likely to make possible such experience for others? The Mediæval Church sought to render Education Christian by controlling the texts to be studied in school and university. Such attempts achieved little. There are no Christian and non-Christian subjects any more than there are democratic and non-democratic subjects—a contention that has had to be confuted in both France and the United States. What we find are Christian and non-Christian teachers and methods of presentation which either promote or retard the development of a Christian consciousness. Teachers of Science, Mathematics, and the Practical Arts inevitably have less direct means at their disposal for contributing to this development than teachers of Literature and History. It is therefore all the more important for them to make other contacts with their pupils so that the latter may recognize their personal qualities and convictions. Extra-class activities and the general discipline of schools must contribute to the desired end—this 'nutrition of impulse,' to borrow a happy phrase from Ezra Pound. The three main notes of Christianity must be discernible all the time: pupils and teachers alike must be free because (as Charlotte Mason constantly urged) both should recognize that they are under an authority which holds for both; and this disciplined life should render them capable of altruistic living: 'For belief in God, whatever else it may involve,' Professor MacMurray declares, 'at least includes the capacity to live as part of the whole of things in a world which is unified.' It is thus Christianity overcomes the problem of the 'spare parts.' There are none.

The wider range of educational activities which embrace Service of Youth and all forms of Adult Education must also be reconsidered against the background of the Christian view. Continental theologians such as Keller, like Dr. Inge among ourselves, see in the contemporary movement in English and American Christianity an extension of the Incarnation, whereby men actuated by the Holy Spirit undertake the moral and social transformation of the world. While this view represents something less than the catastrophic break with naturalistic and liberal optimism which Barth and Niebuhr demand, or the drastic Christian Realism of MacMurray and the late Father Conrad Noel, it goes far towards meeting the challenge of contemporary revolutionary movements by emphasizing that for Englishmen and Americans religion is not merely an affair of church attendance but permeates the most various human activities.

Yet such miscellaneous education as we are considering will fail to attain its supreme end, will fail to take its proper place in a complete scheme for Christian education, if it regards Christianity solely as the motive-power which supplies it with leaders, instructors and workers. The 'set' of the whole undertaking must be rendered Christian. Activities should be sifted, and those which neither free men and lead to personal discipline based on allegiance to One with an incontestable right to be owned as Master, nor tend to purposeful service of the community, should be dropped; and the reason for dropping them should be openly stated. Old-fashioned taboos are no longer valid, but new generations must find new standards. If we reject Red Virtue and Planned Virtue, we must make all the more certain that we promote a Christian consciousness which will result in a morality no less heroic and positive.

Nor let us forget the significance that attaches to the very multifariousness of such activities. Each assists, or should assist, some aspect of the fuller life whose *raison d'être* is the heavenly society. The concentric circles beloved of mediæval political thinkers—home, trade guild, township, country, empire—gave a false picture of Reality, which is rather to be compared to a collection of intersecting circles, none of them containing another and each possessing intrinsic value. The liberty to secede from one society and found a new one is one of the essential liberties, and such free activities as we have been thinking of, along with sectarianism in church life, have, in the opinion of careful observers like Dr. Hans and Christopher Dawson, historically prevented England and the countries of the British Commonwealth from becoming the unified and stereotyped tyrannies familiar to the Continent. The free

existence and interplay of such societies is above all necessary to preserve the prophetic note for humanity.

All liberty, however, is costly, and the price of such liberty as we seek must be the readiness of individuals either to serve as prophets or to obey them, so that more and more the principles of the Heavenly Order may be realized in this world. If we flinch from either responsibility and fail to give mankind greater benefits than a planned order would give, we stand self-condemned, and condemned also of God. If we obey our Voices, though men slay us (or merely disapprove of us and will not listen to us) the Word will have free utterance, and that utterance will always be creative, redemptive, fructifying.

Literature.

LUTHER THE THEOLOGIAN.

Luther was a man of rare and deep religious intuition; and his intuitions found an abundant theological expression, sometimes vivid and passionate, but more often sober, equable, and restrained. But he was not, like Calvin, a systematic theologian, and his system of doctrine must be pieced together from his various writings.

Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jun., Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton, has made it possible for us to gain a good impression of what Luther's system of doctrine would look like. In his recent work, *A Compend of Luther's Theology* (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net), he has done for Luther what he had already done for Calvin, but it has been a more difficult task. It is comparatively easy to present in brief compass and in the author's own language the heart of the 'Institutes.' So to present Luther's theology means much wider reading and a vast perplexity in selection. And we must not quarrel with Dr. Kerr if in the interests of systematic presentation he has passed by many a passage tempting to the anthologist.

Yet we find here not a few of Luther's pithy and forceful passages. Here is the anti-rationalist speaking: 'How I regret now that I did not read more poets and historians, and that no one taught me them! I was obliged instead to read, with great cost, labour and injury, that devil's filth, the philosophers and sophists, from which I have all I can do to get myself clean.' Here is the dogmatician speaking, in as speculative a vein as the poet Milton: 'I fully believe that, before his sin, the eyes of Adam were so clear and their sight so acute, that his powers of vision exceeded those of the lynx. Adam, I believe, being stronger than they, handled lions and bears, whose strength is so great, as we handle the young of any animal.' And here is Luther in his homely style: 'Those preachers who say whatever comes into their mouths remind me of a maid going to market. When she meets another maid she stops and chats a while, then she meets another and talks with her too, and then a third and a fourth, and so gets to market very slowly. So with preachers who wander off the text; they would like to say everything at one time, but they can't.'

In his quotations from Luther's works Dr. Kerr traverses the ground not only of Christian Dogmatics but also that of Christian Ethics. Here he introduces an element of topicality into his 'compend' by giving a special chapter to Luther's conception of the relation between the Christian and the State. Undoubtedly the total impression one derives from Luther's words is that Christians are subject to the civil government whether it be right or wrong, just or tyrannical; and it may be that the Lutheran passivity towards the State contributed at least to the rise of the German political tyranny of our time. On the other hand, as Dr. Kerr remarks in his Foreword, 'the stand of Pastor Niemöller in Germany and of Bishop Berggrav in Norway gives the lie to those who would roundly accuse the Lutheran Church of indifferentism in matters political.'

In a volume so well printed and arranged, and so attractive in form, it is a pity to find at p. 40 so bad a misprint as 'Apostle's Symbol, or Apostle's Creed.'

W. Fulton.

SUMERIAN TEXTS.

The Sumerian religious literature is still very imperfectly known and has to be reconstructed from tablets, mostly fragmentary, excavated at various sites and now dispersed among the museums and private collections of several countries. Many of the tablets from the British Museum, the Louvre, the Berlin Museums, and elsewhere have been published at various times but only a small start has hitherto been made with the particularly fine collection excavated at Nippur between 1889 and 1900, most of which found its way either to the University Museum at Philadelphia or to the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul. The appearance of Volume XXIII. of *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, under the title *Sumerian Literary Texts from Nippur* (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven; $2.50) is therefore very welcome. It contains a copy of a hundred and sixty-seven hitherto unpublished tablets from Istanbul, including examples of all the main categories of Sumerian religious literature, namely, epics, myths, hymns, lamentations and 'wisdom' literature. The copies are clearly and beautifully executed and it is a pity that many had to be reduced in size to suit the volume, since some are now uncomfortably small and occasionally even

difficult to decipher. Dr. S. N. Kramer, Associate Curator of the University Museum at Philadelphia, who is the author of the work, has long been known as a competent expert in this difficult class of text, and his painstaking identifications, citations of duplicates where such are known, and descriptions of the literary contents are invaluable. The book is of interest, however, mainly to the expert, as no transliterations or translations are offered. It is to be hoped that Dr. Kramer will be able to fulfil his project of copying and publishing the remaining tablets, some 1200 in number, which still await attention in Philadelphia and Istanbul.

CECIL J. MULLO WEIR.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY METHODISM.

Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century is the title of a further study of early Methodism by the Rev. Robert F. Wearmouth, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D., H.C.F. (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). The twenty pages which are most relevant to the title bring out the way in which, at a period when the management of affairs was everywhere else entirely in the hands of the privileged, Methodism opened to the humblest opportunities of responsible activity in public speech, in the control of finances, in sick visitation, and in the office of the ministry.

The first third of the book is simply a detailed summary of the record of disturbances, distresses, and legal brutalities in that century; disturbances largely caused by the spectacle of food exportation in times of scarcity and rising prices; distresses through hunger and cold and unemployment; the horrible savagery of the enforcement of law and order by the hanging of thousands of adults, youths, and children for petty thefts, and the transportation of other thousands as a more lenient sentence, while critics demanded sterner measures, and mobs pelted to death wretches condemned to stand in the pillory, and judges prefaced their penalties by solemn religious and moral lectures on the enormity of the offence. It is a terrible and pitiful narrative, belonging to the general social history of that period.

The next section of the book is a very full and careful survey of the evidence of Wesley's reluctance to separate from the Anglican Church and of the development of the breach. It is followed by a similar review of the scurrilous abuse, persecution, and mob violence by which Wesley and his preachers were assailed. Here the sympathy and indignation awakened in the reader do not prevent him from feeling puzzled on one point. How did Wesley, unprotected amid hostile and often drunken mobs wielding staves and flinging stones as well as mud, escape fatal injury? The explanation that his small stature made him difficult to hit is more ingenious than convincing. Was there more horse-play and less vicious hatred in these disorderly attacks than the records suggest?

The perusal of this material raises questions the author does not ask. How was it that Christian England allowed itself to be so callous and barbarous in its social life? And how was it that John Wesley, with his constant pitying earnestness in bringing the gospel to the crowded prisons—and it is to be noted that these prisoners, like victims of Russian purges in recent years, seem to have accepted without protest the social verdict that they really were criminals—and with his very practical and successful, if limited, schemes of charity, economic assistance and medical relief in London, did not see that direct political agitation and action was a moral imperative for the Christian conscience? Wesley's political outlook may be gathered from his words: 'If the best of Kings, the most virtuous of Queens and the most perfect constitution could make any nation happy the people of this country have every reason to think themselves so.' Here is a field for such a psychological study as Aldous Huxley made in 'Grey Eminence' in another connexion.

Yet the broad fact remains as Dr. Wearmouth says, that it was Wesley's religious interest in and approach to the outcast that led the way to the modern recognition of the social obligations of a Christian community toward all its members. The religion which brought a consoling message of pardon and hope to those condemned by a merciless law became, to use Kingsley's word, often attributed to Marx, not 'dope' but the needed vitamin for the atrophied conscience of the nation.

A most valuable addition to the text of the book is the bibliography at the end, which will be stimulating and helpful to any one contemplating a study of Wesley and Methodism.

R. W. STEWART.

ORTHODOX SPIRITUALITY.

The Orthodox way to holiness is the subject of *Orthodox Spirituality: An Outline of the Orthodox Ascetical and Mystical Tradition*, by a Monk of the Eastern Church (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net).

Perfect holiness is union with God, by 'incorporation' into Christ, and Orthodox theologians do not hesitate to designate it as a deification (*theosis*). It is attained by ascetic exercises and mystic contemplation, supported by the Holy Mysteries or Sacraments, as 'means of grace.'

Incorporation into Christ is effected, not by the will but through grace. The Holy Mystery of Penance is a sharing in baptismal grace; the Baptizing Christ is a forgiving and recreating Christ; by the grace of Baptism man becomes a new creation, fit for 'Christification.' Pentecostal grace imparts the Holy Spirit in the Mystery of Chrismation (Confirmation). Eucharistic grace fulfils the grace of Baptism and the Chrisma in the Paschal Mystery.

For the uninitiated the difficulty is to understand what is meant by sacramental or divine 'grace.' Baptismal grace is not connected with the death of Christ nor is Eucharistic grace with the forgiveness of sins. There is, in fact, no doctrine of the Sacraments: they are Holy Mysteries and divine grace is indefinable.

In the absence of a doctrine of Grace in the New Testament sense of a divine dispensation of mercy by the death of Christ, Orthodox theology has never been quite free from the suspicion of Pelagianism. Hence the prominence in Orthodox spirituality of the ascetic element. And where 'grace' is a mysterious supernatural reality, mysticism becomes the second main element in the Orthodox life of the spirit. The highest spiritual life is a synergy of ascetic effort and contemplative mysticism, where holiness consists of a 'straining after' divine 'grace.'

The book is a faithful presentation of the Orthodox tradition of the spiritual life and a useful introduction to its subject.

MATTHEW BLACK.

The life of a great modern missionary, *A Maker of Modern China*, by Mr. Albert J. Garnier (Carey Press; 5s. net), has values and interest beyond the account it gives of the career of Timothy Richard. It contains an intelligent account of Chinese history since 1869, beginning with a survey of pre-revolution China and the forces making for revolution, then an account of the great revolution which overthrew the Manchu dynasty in 1911, with sketches of famous Chinese leaders like Li Hung Chang and Sun Yat Sen, and finally a chapter setting forth the China of to-day. The important part which Timothy Richard played at the time of the revolution and all through this critical period is sketched in with knowledge and sympathy, and the book closes with an able review of the situation at the present time. The author sketches the major religious forces in China now—Confucianism, Buddhism, Communism, and Christianity, and gives us his answer to the vital question: Which of these religions will China turn to as the satisfaction of her soul-hunger and the solution of her problems? Mr. Garnier is fair and points out honestly the attractions in the rival faiths. But in the end he expresses the conviction that there is good ground for the hope that China will choose Christianity. But it must be a real Christianity, both 'good news of God' and a message of promise for China's whole life.

A delightful little book of extracts from the letters of Erskine of Linlathen has been made by Professor W. Fraser Mitchell, M.A., B.Litt., and published with the title *The Purpose of Life* (Epworth Press; 1s. 6d. net). There is a short sketch of Erskine which precedes the selection and will give some idea of the man to those to whom he is unknown. Erskine of Linlathen is, however, familiar to very many as one of the men who humanized the exaggerated Calvinism which reigned in Scotland at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He is also one of the masters of the spiritual life. And this choice of some of his intimate thoughts on life and religion may well be found helpful and comforting to those who have an open heart.

'*What do ye?*,' by Professor C. Ryder Smith (Epworth Press; 6s. net). The thesis of this book is that the whole of the practical Christian ideal of life is implied in love to the God who loves men. The foundation of Christian ethic is religion and everything in it derives from this one principle. All that we get however in the New Testament is either picturesque gnomic statements symbolizing the principle, but, though arresting and stimulating, no more to be taken as literal truth than the proverb 'a stitch in time saves nine'; or else applications of the principle to particular circumstances which are never exactly our circumstances, so that these New Testament solutions of the problem of applying the principle in the way which will most fully realize its purpose are never authoritative though they may be illuminating and suggestive. In short, there are no Christian rules and just one principle. The good life is not a science but an art. The highest obedience requires the illumination and inspiration of the Spirit.

This is no new doctrine, but it is helpful to see how so competent a thinker establishes the position for himself, and there are many things in his clear-cut presentation that will startle vague minds.

The demand is for an intelligent and passionate devotion to the principle of divine love and a fearless exercise of the freedom of the Spirit, a baptism of spirit and of fire. A difficulty in writing about this is that the single principle may be made to seem too abstracted from realities and the exercise of freedom seem to make room for casuistical evasions. The temperature then drops and the way is opened for a man to say too easily, 'Yes, that is my principle and I am applying it as far as it is feasible.' Of this difficulty the author is, and makes his readers, aware, but with all its truth and clarity does his book quite overcome it?

The author of a *New Testament Commentary* (Holman Company, Philadelphia; $3.75) is Mr. George M. Lamsa, described on the title-page as 'Ethnologist' and 'Aramaic Language Expert.' He is an Assyrian, born and bred near Abraham's birthplace. His book of more than six hundred pages consists of rather dull comments on various verses in Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse. It is a profound pity that Mr. Lamsa has not added to his expertness in Aramaic some knowledge of the findings of modern criticism. It chanced that we opened his book at p. 437 to find a comment on 2 Ti 4^{13} and there learned first that the A.V. ought to have translated 'bookcase' for 'cloak,' and had hardly recovered from our astonishment when we read: 'After his conversion Paul devoted much of his time to the study of the Scriptures (Four Gospels) which he had copied while in Syria and Jerusalem.' Elsewhere, Mr. Lamsa seems to be under the impression that Paul wrote his Epistles in Aramaic, though he concedes that he probably had a little Greek. Mr. Lamsa is obviously in earnest; just as obviously he knows some Aramaic; but he

must realize that an acquaintance with our Lord's mother-tongue does not atone for an abysmal ignorance of the conclusions of modern criticism.

The London Missionary Society is celebrating this year its triple jubilee, and the Rev. Cecil Northcott, who wields a practised pen, has been commissioned to write its history. The title is *Glorious Company* (Livingstone Press; 5s. net). Here, in just under two hundred pages, Mr. Northcott tells the romantic story of the Society's founding, its progress, and its expansion until the present day. For those who have not time to read the larger volumes on this subject by Mr. Richard Lovett (now being completed by the Rev. Norman Goodall), Mr. Northcott's book will prove a *multum in parvo*. Mr. Northcott has sifted his sources with a fine discrimination; has arranged his materials most attractively; and has written throughout with charm and grace. At the end he has added maps showing the spheres of the Society's missionary effort: China, Madagascar, India, Africa, the South Pacific, and Papua. There are seven excellent photographs. In these days when we are becoming more and more aware of the world-church as a *fait accompli*, and of the marvellous missionary expansion of the last one hundred and fifty years, we cannot have too many books of the quality of Mr. Northcott's.

The Man India Loved, whom J. S. Hoyland presents in this little book (Lutterworth Press; 4s. 6d. net), is C. F. Andrews, and there is no doubt that that is a true designation of him. The more we know of how C. F. Andrews won the love of India, the better it will be for India. Mr. Hoyland has written at least one other book about his friend and he writes from an intimate knowledge of Andrews' endless labours in the cause of the land of his affection and its people. Mr. Hoyland has adopted a method of presenting his subject which he used in an earlier book called 'We Who are India.' It contains twenty-five imaginary soliloquies by Indians who speak as representing sometimes social groups, such as 'Moslem' or 'Coolie,' or sometimes as victims of famine or plague or pestilence. Into each soliloquy C. F. Andrews is introduced as (what he often may have seemed to unhappy people whom he helped) a *deus ex machina* suddenly descending from the skies. In some cases actual encounters with Andrews are made use of and—as it were—dramatized, but it cannot be denied that the situations are unconvincing and the language put into the mouth of the speaker is often unrealistic. A straightforward account of Andrews' life of self-sacrifice would, one cannot help thinking, be more effective. Nevertheless the stories are well conceived and show wide knowledge of India's needs. It is well that India and Andrews should be 'placarded' before those who are so slow to realize how much friends such as this man was can do for India and how eager its people are in responding to such friendship.

Ideas Have Legs, by Mr. Peter Howard (Frederic Muller; 7s. 6d. net), is an attractive title, and the book is as attractive as the title. Peter Howard is a well-known and eminent journalist. He was on the staff of the *Daily Express* and was an intimate confidant of Lord Beaverbrook. He met Mr. Churchill and many other notable figures and gives us his estimate of them. He was a sportsman and a man of the world, and his reminiscences are narrated with a verve and liveliness that make the first part of the book a continual delight. One can understand his success as a journalist. You are carried forward in the midst of all sorts of interesting happenings until one day at lunch a man made an arresting remark to Howard, literally arresting. It made him get down to rock-bottom in his life and swept him into the Oxford Group. It was a typical 'Oxford Group' conversion. From that point the book is red-hot in propaganda, but it is just as interesting as the 'worldly' part. As a study in conversion it merits a proper and sincere consideration. And this estimate will be not less worth while because it is in a setting that is completely human.

Professor Duncan M. Blair, Regius Professor of Anatomy in the University of Glasgow, was a distinguished scientific teacher and was also a deeply religious man. He was a member of the Free Church of Scotland and identified himself with the Inter-Varsity Fellowship, two facts which will reveal his theological and ecclesiastical standpoint. He was very popular with students and exercised a deep influence on many of them at a critical period of their life. Two books, or booklets, have been issued to commemorate his service to his University, to youth, and to his generation. The first is *Professor Duncan M. Blair, D.Sc., M.B., F.R.F.P.S., A Book of Remembrance*, compiled and edited by Mr. Alexander Gammie, and consisting of many tributes from various people (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. net). The second, *The Beginning of Wisdom*, consisting of essays and addresses on various themes, is published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (2s. 6d. net).

Many of us, certainly many among the older of us, will remember the stimulus that came to us from George Archibald in our whole outlook on religious education. He will be remembered as the apostle of grading in our teaching of the young and in our arrangement of the Sunday School and in our syllabuses. But indeed he will be gratefully remembered for the revolution he wrought in our whole attitude to the child. He was the forerunner of much of the modern way of teaching. He was at any rate the instrument through which the ideas of the great educational pioneers reached the ordinary teacher and were applied to the teaching of the Bible. It was fitting therefore that his life should be written, and by one who by relationship and understanding is capable of discharging this task adequately, as it has been done in *George Hamilton Archibald: Crusader for Youth*, by Mrs. Ethel Archibald

Johnston (his daughter) (Religious Education Press ; 5s. net). The main principle in the present-day approach to religious education is that the child is central. It is his need and capacity that must determine syllabus and instruction. And this was the principle that determined all Archibald's thinking and planning. It is to be hoped that this biography will challenge our present practice as he himself challenged the practice of his day. For though he has taught us much, we have much to learn, and, still more, we have much he taught to put into action.

Increasingly, teachers are leaning to the project of representation of Bible scenes and stories in dramatic form. Miss Evelyn A. Downs has written and edited a book which should help them in such an enterprise—*The Bible as Drama* (Religious Education Press ; 1s. 6d. net). There is an introduction on dramatizing the Bible, another chapter with 'hints on producing plays,' and then four Biblical plays—Joseph, Daniel, Jonah, and one that covers the whole story in Bethlehem. There is also a list of useful addresses. This is not the only book recently published on dramatizing Scripture, but it has merits which will commend it to the attention of the teaching profession.

God Is Not Dead (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. 6d. net), by the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton, is a study of 'the mysterious workings of Providence in everyday life.' It falls into two parts. In the first the point chiefly emphasized is the overruling hand of God in matters connected with St. Paul's journeys. For example, why was he prevented from carrying out on his Second Journey the plans he had in mind ? In the second part incidents recorded in the story of the Early Church are related to incidents of the Church of to-day, the link between them being the belief in providential governance. The book, which is thoughtful in style and devout in tone, is full of illustrative instance, both old and new, and is the product of careful Biblical study, especially of the Acts of the Apostles. (By the way, Dr. J. A. Robertson, cited on p. viii., is happily still with us.)

The Christian Churches and International Peace (S.C.M. ; 1s. net) is the Archbishop of York's Burge Memorial Lecture for 1945. One need not hope to see a short statement of the Church's position more clear and wise and adequate and persuasive than this of Dr. Garbett's. Noting the unrealistically optimistic and narrowly national outlook of the past he pierces to the heart of the matter when he insists that the repudiation on religious grounds of the claim of the Totalitarian State to supreme authority over its own citizens is logically accompanied by the repudiation of its claim to unlimited sovereignty in its relation to other States. The reality of Divine authority limits the rights of the State alike in its internal administration and its foreign relations. As a clear-sighted realist, therefore, the Christian can see no assurance of perpetual peace without a practical plan for limiting national sovereignty.

The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (Tyndale Press ; 2s. 6d. net) is based on the Tyndale New Testament Lecture, 1942, delivered by Mr. F. F. Bruce, M.A., under the auspices of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions. The object of the writer is to survey the chief Christian speeches reported in the Acts. He finds that they fall into four main groups, which he calls evangelistic, deliberative, apologetic, and hortatory. He discusses the question of the degree in which these speeches, as recorded by Luke, convey what was actually said on the various occasions. He does not ask us to suppose that the speeches are *verbatim* reports in the sense that they record every word used by the speakers, but he concludes that they are at least 'faithful epitomes,' giving the gist of what was said in each case, and accordingly valuable sources for the history and thought of the Early Church. The footnotes show in themselves how wide, scholarly, and up to date has been the author's reading.

The Theology of Prepositions, by Mr. Basil F. C. Atkinson, M.A., Ph.D. (Tyndale Press ; 2s. 6d. net). As a partisan may be an enthusiast for his tommy-gun or bazooka, Dr. Atkinson is an enthusiast for prepositions. 'This preposition,' he exclaims, 'makes a superb contribution to theology.' We cannot say this pamphlet does. While dismissing many passages in the New Testament as of no theological importance it finds in other phrases that the prepositions yield support for what he calls 'the scriptural theory of the Atonement.' In his parade of meticulous exactitude in counts and instances the author is untrustworthy. 'With rare exceptions ἕως is used by Matthew and Mark and ἄχρι by Luke.' The fact is that the author of Luke uses each word about twenty times. In saying εἰς occurs some twelve hundred times in the New Testament he seems to differ by about eight hundred from Moulton and Geden, and to differ still more about the frequency of ἐν. One does not follow how quotations of the use of ὑπό in the phrases 'by a storm,' 'by a great wind,' lead up to the assertion 'the invariable use of that preposition in the phrase "by the Spirit" goes far to proving that the writers regarded him as a person.' However, that doesn't matter ; for ὑπό is *not* invariably used for the Holy Spirit's agency, διά is quite common !

The Study of the New Testament.[1]

By the Reverend A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., Perth.

I.

If an unbeliever, or perhaps some wistful seeker after God, were to ask us, 'Why should I study the New Testament? What do you Christians believe there is in the New Testament which can be found in no other book?' how should we answer?

Before we go further, let us take a broad glance at the book. A cursory inspection reveals that it is not really one book but a whole library of books—twenty-seven in all. And what a literary miscellany it is! We begin with four documents called 'Gospels' which at first blush look like biographies, but on further perusal hardly fit into our modern notions of biographical writing; then comes a volume of history (Acts); then follow twenty-one documents generally labelled 'Epistles' in our English Bible, though that term, as we find later, comprises many literary types, from a massive theological treatise (Romans) to a charming little private letter (Philemon) and includes a rhetorical homily (Hebrews) and an ethical scrap-book (James); and the whole miscellany is rounded off with a book of visions named 'The Revelation of St. John the Divine.'

Here plainly is a happy hunting-ground for the man who is interested in literary forms and types. Is it then for its *literary* interest that we ask men to study the New Testament, especially as it comes to most of us in the glorious English of the forty-seven men who made the Authorized Version? No; as a matter of fact, from a purely literary point of view, the New Testament is greatly inferior to that other volume which is usually—and rightly—bound up along with the New Testament, and which we call the Old Testament. (If you examine any anthology of English prose—as, for example, Logan Pearsall Smith's *Treasury of English Prose*, you will note that the literary man finds far more in the Old Testament to praise than he does in the New.) To be sure, there are not a few passages in the New Testament whose superb simplicity of style or splendour of expression give them an unchallengeable place in the world's literature. Where in all literature will you find a story more movingly and exquisitely told than in the Parable of the Prodigal Son? Where a nobler prose-poem than the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians? Where a finer piece of pure eloquence than the roll-call of the heroes of faith in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews? Yet it is not for that reason primarily that we invite men to study the New Testament. True it is that a man may begin by studying the New Testament with a purely literary concern and end up by studying it for some quite other and deeper reason, as Augustine in his pre-conversion days went to hear Ambrose preach in Milan, interested not in *what* Ambrose said but in *how* he said it: but by and by had to confess that while he opened his heart 'to admit the eloquence of his utterances there gradually entered likewise a conviction of the truth of what he said.' Nevertheless, it is not primarily for its literary splendours that we bid men study the New Testament.

II.

Is it then perchance for its pure and lofty *moral* teaching? Christianity being admittedly a method of goodness—*God's* way of making men good—is it because we have in the New Testament a matchless guide-book to the good life that men ought to study it? Is it as the world's supreme text-book on ethics that the New Testament commands the attention of all interested in the problem of right living?

That is the answer of some. But if the peculiar virtue of the New Testament lie in its ethics, clearly three-fourths of it must be regarded as otiose and irrelevant. Since most of the pure gold of the New Testament's ethical teaching can be found in the Sermon on the Mount, one or two passages of St. Paul, the Epistle of James, and a few other places, we must (on this view) conclude that the bulk of the New Testament is, for all practical purposes, so much literary dross to be thrown away. Some people think that is what ought to be done. They lavish their praise on the Sermon on the Mount and the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, but they can only regret that these ethical treasures come to us embedded in such a fantastic framework of myth and supernaturalism. What we ought to do (say they) is to conserve this precious ethical residuum at all costs, while we consign the myth and miracle to the limbo of forgotten things. Thus Dr. Klausner, the eminent Jewish scholar, would like to preserve 'the Book of the Ethics of Jesus' (presumably the Sermon on the Mount) after ridding it of its 'wrappings of miracle and mysticism,' and that fine-minded humanist Professor Gilbert Murray

[1] Hon. President's address at New College Theological Society, Oct. 1944.

is apparently of much the same way of thinking.

But of course no Christian man could ever agree to this. To jettison all the 'miracle and mysticism' would be, for him, to jettison most of what makes the New Testament precious; and while he may boggle at a few of the miracles, he realizes quite clearly that a New Testament containing only selected ethical passages would be something very like *Hamlet* with the Prince of Denmark left out. Besides, a very elementary understanding of the New Testament tells him that this drastic purge of the New Testament is utterly arbitrary; for whether we like it or not, the ethics of the New Testament are inseparably bound up with the religion of the New Testament (which includes miracle and mysticism); and in short, the notion that we can wander in this eclectic fashion through, say, the teaching of Jesus, as through a garden, plucking here and there a flower for the adornment of our particular philosophy of life, is as futile as it is unfair. No; we do not bid men read the New Testament primarily for its ethics.

III.

Others there are who finding the quintessence of Christianity in 'Christ's views about God and the Sermon on the Mount' (to quote the late Dick Sheppard) think that it is for these that we ought to read the New Testament.

Behind this view lies the assumption (whether avowed or not) that Christianity is 'the last and loftiest construction which man has put upon the Infinite.' On this view, for example, the Christian view of God is the grand discovery of that great spiritual genius, Jesus of Nazareth, 'the Columbus of the spiritual world who has by searching found out God.'

Moreover, in the teaching of this spiritual genius meet all our highest ideas of duty and conduct. Morality as we see it in the Sermon on the Mount, has come forth from His hands a new creation, and in it we are to find the noblest expression of man's duty on this earth. Because the New Testament is the repository of this noble teaching about God and man's duty, we ought to study it and prize it above all the religious classics of mankind.

This is some advance on the previous view. Let us not speak scornfully of men who find in the New Testament no more than this; but let us also be clear that if it is in 'Christ's views about God and the Sermon on the Mount' that the value of the New Testament lies, once again most of the New Testament ought to go into the waste-paper basket, or be preserved only for its antiquarian interest. For the corollary of this view is that Paul, John, the Writer to the Hebrews, and the rest of them who found in Christ not merely the supreme spiritual genius of the race but in some sense the very God stooping low for us men and our salvation, ought to be written off as misguided enthusiasts who have turned the beautiful 'idyll of Galilee' into a cosmic drama of redemption.

This view is in fact contrary to the whole tenor of the New Testament. For, certainly, the New Testament writers as a whole never lead us to believe that what they have to give us is men's thoughts about God, however sublime; what they claim to give us is God's Word—His final Word—about Himself. And now, as the children say, 'we are really getting hot. . . .'

IV.

For what then primarily (to come to the crux of the matter) are we to study the New Testament?

It is a prime canon of all criticism that in dealing with any work of art or literature our chief endeavour should be to understand what the Greeks would call its τὸ τι ἦν εἶναι—'the thing it was to be.' If applying this canon to the New Testament, we ask what the New Testament writers claim to give us, the answer is: neither belles-lettres, nor superfine ethics, nor even lofty 'views about God,' but 'Good News,' Good News *from* God, authentic tidings of God's goodwill made manifest to redeem and deliver sinful men. And, to this day, when simple men and women go to the New Testament, this is what they seek. They do not seek fine literature: they can get that in Shakespeare or many another. They do not seek merely moral light and leading: they can get that in the writings of many a good and wise man of this world. They do not even seek 'views about God': they can get these in any elementary handbook of comparative religion. They seek Good News of Salvation. Beset behind and before with sin and guilt, perplexed and bewildered by the burden and mystery of life, they seek a 'Word-from-the-Beyond' for man's predicament. And it is just because the New Testament is from beginning to end one unwavering and triumphant testimony that God *has* spoken this Word, that it occupies a place of solitary splendour in the literature of the world. In fine, the importance of the New Testament is that it purports to be the record of a unique self-revelation of the living God on the stage of human history.

That revelation may be summed up in various ways:

'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself' (Paul).

'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us' (John).

'God has spoken to us in a Son' (Hebrews).

But however varied be the expression, it is always the record of the inconceivable condescension of God to us men for our salvation in Jesus Christ His Son. Of course there is a great deal else besides this in the New Testament; but whatever it be—narrative, exhortation, ethics, exegesis of the Old Testament, etc.—this is always the grand presupposition and major premise of it all.

No other set of religious books in all the world makes this tremendous claim, and it is this claim which constitutes the unique glory, as it is for many the unique *skandalon* (offence), of the New Testament. As an American scholar has well put it: 'If there be any true myth, if the divine nature has at any time and in any wise revealed itself to men, if any voice shall ever reach us out of the infinite circle of silence, where else shall we look but to the words of the Gospel?'

There are three things that must be said about this record of revelation:

First, it is a revelation that comes by *action* rather than by words, by deeds rather than by doctrines. This is only to say that it is the revelation of 'the living God,' the God who is known by what He does, the God whose workshop is the stuff of human history. We recall Goethe's great saying: 'The highest cannot be spoken; it can only be acted.' It is the claim of the New Testament that the All Highest has once for all acted in a special series of events in history—that complex of events which we call succinctly the coming of Christ—in such a way as to show men for ever what He is like.

Second, to claim that the New Testament enshrines a unique self-revelation of God is not to deny that God may reveal Himself generally in other ways. Indeed, you will find in the New Testament several passages which declare, or imply, that God has not left Himself without a witness in Nature and history apart from the revelation in Christ. But the New Testament writers do insist that in the record of God's dealing with a special people, the Jews, given us in the Bible and culminating in the coming of Christ and the creation of the new People of God which is the Church, we have history as a process of divine self-revelation (the German word for it is *Heilsgeschichte*.)

Third, it is because the Bible with the New Testament as its climax and crown, is the record of that unique revelation, that we say it 'contains' the Word of God. 'If I am asked,' wrote Robertson Smith in memorable words, 'why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with all the fathers of the Protestant Church: Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus and declaring to us, in Him, His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.'

V.

Having considered *why* we study the New Testament, let us now consider *how* we ought to do it.

And here I have three advices to give you—first, that you study it critically; second, that you study it 'biblically'; and third, that you study it synthetically.

In this year of grace 1944 and in this home of sacred learning associated with so many great names in the field of Biblical science, you may think it almost an impertinence for me to urge you to study the New Testament critically. But I have good reason for stressing what may seem to you a commonplace. While I taught in Oxford, I was for ever lighting on what I thought was an extinct species—the fundamentalist; and since returning to the ministry of the Church of Scotland I have discovered that not only among the laity but even among the ministers the doctrine of 'verbal inspirationism' dies hard; so that, on at least one occasion recently, a stout Bibliolater has sought to silence me with: 'It's in the Word of God, and that's good enough for me.'

There was perhaps some excuse for a remark like that eighty years ago when Dean Burgon (the man who made the furious attack on Westcott and Hort) could write:

'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth on the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High.'

But there is no excuse for that attitude nowadays, at any rate in the ranks of the ministry of the Church of Scotland, as there is no warrant in the Bible itself for such a claim. No; the only possible approach for you is the critical one. I do not mean by that, that you should make haste to sell your soul to the radical critics. I mean that your studies here should have taught you not only that the critical approach is the only honest one, but also that the Bible and the New Testament in particular have nothing to fear from the side of sober and reverent criticism. From such criticism the record of the revelation of God in Christ emerges clearer and surer than ever before. The day is past when the faithful awaited the latest lucubration of German scholarship with trepidation, convinced that another desperate stroke would be dealt at 'the faith once for all

delivered to the saints.' To be sure, there still exist a few eccentrics who believe that Jesus never lived, as there is an occasional critic who pours doubt on the essential historicity of the Gospel record. But they are as winter swallows and may safely be discounted. For the net result of a hundred years of criticism has been to vindicate the substantial historicity of the New Testament record at point after point, and to set it on surer historical foundations than ever before.

I looked and lo, mid the decay
The Waster was the builder too,
And when the dust-cloud rolled away
I saw the new.

So, study the New Testament critically—with all the rich array of aids that modern scholarship can put in your hands. And do not for a moment suppose that a critical approach is incompatible with that high conception of the New Testament as the record of God's self-revelation in Christ which we considered a few minutes ago. In fact, they really go hand in hand; and one reward of a truly critical approach to the New Testament is that it shows you ever more clearly what the Word of God is in the New Testament and what the word of man. Emil Brunner has put the matter very well. 'He who would know what constitutes the Word of God in the Bible *must* devote himself to Biblical criticism. . . . For it is really the will of God that we shall hear *His* Word, and not mistake ancient cosmology and Israelitish chronology for the Word of God.'

VI.

In the second place, I bid you study the New Testament 'biblically'—that is, against the background of the Old Testament. The Old Testament is the best lexicon for the New. Without a knowledge of the leading ideas of the Old Testament—*e.g.* of the living God and of the Covenant People—you cannot understand the New.

Once again this may strike you as a truism; but if it is, it is one that has just been rediscovered. Listen, for example, to Dr. Vincent Taylor in the preface to his fine book, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*:

'Step by step,' he writes, 'we have been driven back, behind the Apocalyptic literature, to the Old Testament itself, and compelled to see Jesus in its light. In consequence, we have rediscovered the obvious: the Old Testament, we find, is of vital significance for our understanding of the mind and thought of Jesus. We perceive that while we may be hampered by a limited acquaintance with the New Psychology, we are entirely disqualified for the investigation if we do not know the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.'

That is a wise word whose truth you can illustrate very simply by considering such a verse as Mk 10^{45}. 'The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life a ransom for many.' Now I dare not aver that any man has ever fathomed all the depths of the great Ransom passage; but I say without fear of contradiction that you will not begin to understand it until you have laid account with two chapters in the Old Testament: Daniel 7 with its famous reference to 'one like unto a son of man'—and Isaiah 53 with its picture of the Suffering Servant who laid down his life for 'the many.' [Furthermore, unless your Old Testament studies have introduced you to the idea of 'corporate personality' and taught you to think of 'societary individuals,' you will not fully understand this passage. For both the Old Testament figures blended in this great saying are 'societary individuals': they imply a People of God; and the fact that Jesus interpreted His divine destiny in terms of a fusion of these two Old Testament figures shows that He thought of His supreme Action (which we call His Passion) as a societary act—something done for the many which they could not do for themselves.]

Let that one example serve for many. The main point which I want to drive home is that the central theme of the New Testament is only fully intelligible against the background of the Old Testament. That theme is 'the consummation of God's saving purpose for His People through the sending of His Kingdom and Messiah.' The consummation, observe. Thus to define the central theme of the New Testament is to put it in its proper Biblical setting—to see it as our Lord Himself and the Apostles saw it. Seen thus, the Bible is not only a collection of records of the development of religious ideas among Israelites, Jews, and Christians, but also and primarily the story of God's saving purpose for His People begun with the deliverance from Egypt, continued in His later dealings with them recorded in Old Testament history and prophecy, and consummated in the sending of His Son the Messiah:

God, who to glean the vineyard of His choosing
Sent them evangelists till day was done,
Bore with the churls, their wrath and their refusing,
Gave at the last the glory of His Son.

VII.

Last of all, I bid you study the New Testament synthetically—*i.e.* with an eye to its essential unity.

Here there is no need for me to speak at length; for I have said what I think needs saying in my little book, *The Unity of the New Testament*. But a few general remarks may be pardoned. And, to begin with, I say that for too long we have been under the spell of the analytical approach to the New Testament, an approach which while it has

brought us much good, has also brought us much evil. On the one hand, it has meant that particular sections of the New Testament have received a microscopic study that has shed light on passage after passage and crux after crux. But there is profound truth in the old adage that a man may lose sight of the wood because his gaze is focused on individual trees; and that, I think, has happened all too often in the field of New Testament studies. Thus we have had our analytic text-books on New Testament theology with their series of 'separate compartment' chapters, each bearing its label—Synoptic, Pauline, Johannine, etc.—and the student after reading them has all too often received the impression that in the New Testament we have not one but several Gospels; and your plain man, even more hopelessly bewildered, has asked helplessly which particular brand of New Testament theology has the best right to be accounted truly Christian. I say that this is all wrong. I say that deeper than all the diversities in the New Testament there is an underlying unity—a common kerygma, a common doctrine of the Church, a common doctrine of salvation.

I say also in the words of a great Scottish New Testament scholar that 'it needs the *whole* of the New Testament to show what Christ is'; and that the urgent need of the hour in this matter of Biblical theology is a series of text-books written by men from this synthetic viewpoint, written by men who are more than merely Gospel scholars, or Pauline scholars, or Johannine scholars—men like James Denney in the last generation and C. H. Dodd in this one who see that through the whole New Testament, despite all differences of emphasis, there runs one common message of salvation which centres in that Person, who is the Master of us all, and whose is the only name given under heaven whereby we must be saved.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Medicine Instead.

By the Reverend J. Clifford Mitchell, Birkenhead.

'Freely give.'—Mt 10[8].

A few weeks ago a friend of mine returned from China where he has been doing missionary work for several years. He was telling me how much he enjoyed his aeroplane trip from China to India. He told me that before he could take his place in the 'plane he was weighed, and if the things he carried in his clothing and in his hands weighed over 200 lbs. he had to leave some of the things behind; it didn't matter how valuable they were, they couldn't be taken. Then a few weeks later I heard a lovely story of Princess Juliana. This story is of something she freely gave. She had decided to return to England from New York by 'plane. When she arrived at the aerodrome she was told that her clothes and belongings weighed nearly 200 lbs. Then, a few minutes later along came a man who said to her, 'If you are willing to leave behind your clothes and belongings you could take 195 lbs. of valuable liquid food—food given by means of injection—for the undernourished children of Holland; children who are so weak that they cannot keep down food taken as we take it.' Did the Princess say, 'Oh no, I can't leave behind my valuable clothes and other things?' No. Without hesitating she said, 'Oh yes, I don't mind what happens to my things if I can do something that will help the children of Holland.' You see, Princess Juliana knew that the people of Holland and others had given so much that she might be free, so in return she gave space in a 'plane which she might have used for herself to help those who had done much for her. When the people of Holland hear this story they will say, 'Our Princess is not one who soon forgets.' Don't you think it is worth while all of us remembering these words? 'Freely ye have received, freely give.'

To-day we are able to go to school, enjoy our games, and sleep in our beds without feeling afraid, because lots of people have given so much. We ought not to forget their giving. We should say, 'We shall not be able to thank you, but we will express our thanks by trying, and trying really hard, to fill this world with kindness and love.' None of us is too young to do this work. Jesus was twelve years of age when He said, 'I must do my Father's work.' That work was helping other people, being kind and friendly. He said, 'I not only give my hands to help and heal, my voice to speak words of truth, my feet in friendship, I also give my life, that you may learn how much God loves and cares for you.' Should we not say to Him, 'Freely you have given to us, so freely we give in return.'

Here is a boy who walked into a shop to buy some oranges. He was given the last two. As he turned to leave the shop another boy came in for oranges. 'Sorry,' said the man behind the counter, 'I've just sold the last two.' The boy who had the oranges in his pocket walked out of the shop, and as the other boy came out he thrust an orange into his hand saying, 'You have one of mine!' This boy by his generous action was helping to drive unselfishness out of this world.

By deeds of unselfishness, giving our help freely to those who need it, we are saying 'thank you' to those who have done so much for us.

Twelve and a Wee Boy.

By the Reverend J. B. Wilson, Glasgow.

'There is a lad here.'—Jn 6^9.

The tramcar was very busy. All the seats were occupied and passengers were standing on the lower platform. As the car bumped over points and swung round corners they clutched at the straps, the seats, and at one another to keep themselves from falling. Sometimes, at a stopping place, people would grumble when they were told that no more passengers could be taken on. They would say, 'But there is still room inside for a few more standing passengers.' Then, as the car began to move on again, the conductress would shout to them, 'Only twelve are allowed to stand inside.' And, sure enough, there was a notice pasted on the window which said so. Well, it had said so when it was first put up! But it said something different now, for a boy, or it may have been a girl, coming home from school one day had been busy with a pencil and had written something alongside the figure 12. What the notice now read was this: 'The number of passengers allowed to stand on the lower deck will be 12—*and a wee boy*.'

To one man who read the notice, as it had been altered, and who smiled as he read it, there came the thought that somewhere he had heard or read something about 'twelve and a little boy.' He tried hard to recollect what it was and it puzzled him for quite a bit. Then suddenly he remembered that it was an old and familiar story, a story from the Bible. It was the story which told how Jesus fed five thousand people by the Sea of Galilee. And if you know that story well you will agree that it is a story of 'twelve and a little boy.' You will remember that when Jesus saw the great crowd of people He felt sorry for them because they were far from their homes, and since they had followed Him a long way they were bound to be hungry. And Jesus said to Philip, one of the apostles, 'Where can we buy bread for them to eat?' But Philip wasn't very helpful and seemed to suggest that they hadn't enough money to give such a crowd of people even a little bread to eat, certainly not enough to satisfy their hunger. Then Andrew said, not very hopefully, 'There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes; but what are they among so many?' And indeed five barley loaves and two small fishes wouldn't go very far among five thousand hungry people. And if Philip and Andrew were neither very helpful nor hopeful we may be sure that the other apostles were not of much use in solving this problem. But they were forgetting about Jesus their Lord. What the twelve could not do Jesus did—with the help of a little boy. He took the loaves and fishes and gave thanks, then asked the apostles to divide them among the people. And not only was there enough to satisfy them but there was something left over.

Now sometimes you boys and girls feel that you are so small that you are quite unimportant. Nobody seems to take any notice of you and you long to be 'grown ups,' so that you can do great things in the Church of Jesus and for God's kingdom. But the lesson of this story is that you can do great things now, young as you are and small as you are, if only you will go to Jesus. Like the lad, you may not have much to give, but no matter how little it may be you can trust Jesus to make the most of it.

The Christian Year.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

Christ the Compassionate.

By the Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, B.D., Glasgow.

'When he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.'—Mt 9^{36}.

The Bible, which is the most outspoken of books, often compares men to sheep, a natural comparison in a pastoral country. We moderns, conscious of our inventions and achievements are apt to resent the similitude. It seems derogatory, to say the least of it. There is a sense in which we do right to resent it. Our Lord Himself once exclaimed, and that vehemently, 'How much is a man *better* than a sheep'—man, made in God's image, with eternity in his heart, how much is such a being greater than a beast that perisheth.

The fact remains that there is one characteristic man shares with the sheep. A writer lately spoke of 'that dumb, led animal, the average man.' The phrase conjures up a phenomenon that continually recurs in man's history. In this war and in the last, we have seen the tremendous effects of mass emotion. One man, or one group of men, can whip up the feelings of thousands of men for good or evil. One morning during the last war a mail was delivered at the door of a British statesman, consisting of thousands of post cards, breathing hatred and scurrility. This was at the instigation of a section of the press which provided unthinking men's opinions—with their breakfast. The victim of this sordid abuse we now know to have been one of Britain's best benefactors—Lord Haldane. Such is one shameful instance of the influence of one kind of leadership on 'that dumb, led animal, the average man.' And now turn from such an example to the divine compulsion and influence of Jesus Christ. 'When he saw the multitude, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.' These words were uttered concerning a small nation, Christ's kinsmen after the flesh. To-day, the same Christ utters the same words as He looks with wistful eyes and suffering heart over the

wide world that has nearly bled itself to death, a world of 'God's plenty,' with a superabundance for all, crammed with the materials of happiness and prosperity, and He sees men broken, fainting, disillusioned, 'scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.'

First let us tell ourselves that here is the compassion of One with an inside knowledge of suffering. We read that He looked 'around' Him not 'down upon' these straying folks. He came not 'as a visitor from another planet.' He stood in the midst of the sorrows He would heal. Just as Father Damien's ministry on that island of woe only really began when he could say 'We lepers,' so does the power of Christ's compassion only appear when we remember that it was His constant habit to share men's sorrows. 'In all our afflictions he is afflicted.' This is the wonder and glory of the Incarnation. 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that when He was rich, for your sakes He became poor. He looked not on His own things only, on the glory, the wealth, the blessedness of heaven. He looked on our things also—on our sin, our spiritual poverty, our helplessness and despair, and for us men and our salvation gave up the form of God for the form of a servant.' This complete identification of the Good Shepherd with His flock, caring for them, guarding them, if necessary dying for them—here is comfort desperately needed by suffering men amid the problems for faith, thrust upon them by a world bleeding from war-wounds. That God should be *out* of all this, or *above* it, that while men suffer and die, He should dwell in a land of aloofness, 'coldly sublime, intolerably just,' this is a thought that turns the heart cold and reduces life to a vast, tragic irony. On the other hand, that He cares, works, counter-works, brings good out of evil, redemption out of a Cross, shares our tragedy and burden to the uttermost—assured of *that*, man can wait and toil and suffer with an endurance almost godlike. Christ is One of us, in the midst of us. Of Him may be said in divine measure, what was said of a modern lover of his fellows: 'While there is a lower class, I am in it; while there is a criminal element, I am of it; while there is a soul in prison, I am not free.' Still, as of old, Christ looks round Him on men's fainting hearts, on men driven hither and thither by haunting fears, like sheep without a shepherd. Still as of old, He claims that till there is One Fold, and One Shepherd man's travail shall not cease. Only when we are fired by this conviction and inspired by this compassion shall we even begin to build a world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Again Christ's compassion was no nebulous sentiment. It was eminently practical. It put wise limits on itself. He knew His time was short, His earthly sphere circumscribed, His environment a nation small and obscure. He began where He was, among the people round His feet. Amid these human limitations He lived His life and died His death, convinced all the time that He could not be holden of death and that His influence could not be confined to a few years or to one nation. What He said, what He did, would be for the whole world. So He concentrated on the few around Him; there were lepers He would not be able to heal, maimed He would not be able to recover. The sense of 'the petty done, the undone vast' must often have been present to the mind of Christ. Yet He never let it paralyse Him. He did what He could with His twelve hours in the day, leaving the rest to His Father in heaven.

This is a thought for to-day. As we gaze on Europe, its cities a mass of rubble, its seemingly hopeless disorganization, its thousand necessities clamouring for attention, the vastness of the problems appals us. Our hands fall to our sides. We say in our despair,

> The task we undertake is numbering sands and drinking oceans dry.

There is but one corrective for this unworthy mood. It is here also our privilege to follow Christ and to take up the nearest, urgent duty. Long ago a man stood contemplating a similar scene. A returned exile gazed on devastated Jerusalem, its walls in ruin, symbolic of its national fate. He knew that the longer he gazed on it the sooner would his will to rebuild ooze out of him. So he went straight to the job that was to his hand and got on with it, and soon his example was contagious. As we pause after a great tragic war let us emulate Jedaiah the son of Harumaph and 'repair the wall over against our own house.' Reconciliation, the art of living one with the other, why not begin the experiment in our own family life, in our office, amid the clash of temperament and difference of opinion? And out of that may there not arise a river of healing, meagre it may be to begin with, covering only the ankles, but deepening till it reaches the loins and at last becoming 'waters to swim in,' and 'it shall come to pass that everything shall live whithersoever the river cometh.' Let it be a real thing, this campaign of compassion, infused with His spirit, accomplished for His sake. Man has suffered dreadfully. His faith in the good of existence has been all but shattered. For a generation there will be broken homes, maimed bodies, frustrated lives. Begin at the centre of your life wherever you meet your fellow-men and by word and deed mediate to them the compassion of Jesus.

O brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother!
Where pity dwells, the peace of God is there;
To worship rightly is to love each other,
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.

'He looked upon them and had compassion on them because they were as sheep without a shepherd.' This text has a piercing application for the individual. It speaks direct to all the conflicting forces of the heart within us all. 'Tell me thy name,' said Jesus wistfully to a poor deranged man. 'My name,' he replied, 'I have no name or rather I should have a hundred names; my name is Legion.' 'I am everything by turns and nothing long,' many a man tossed about in this demented world, is fain to admit. 'I am a strange

amalgam of cowardice and courage, of glory and shame, of generosity and meanness. I am wretched with the misery of the masterless, of the sheep without a shepherd.' No one knows better than Christ that there is no rest till a man becomes unanimous with himself, till life becomes one-way traffic, till our spiritual warfare reaches unity of command, till one great passion predominates over all other passions. What a burden is this 'liberty' of ours! What an eerie thing it is in certain lawless moments to be able 'to do what we like'; when a motion of a muscle, this way or that, may hurl us to moral perdition. How supreme is the necessity to bring all things into captivity to a Power we reverence, to a Person we love more than all the poisoned sweetness of sin. Till we surrender without terms to the vehemence of Christ's love we are in this world as strayed sheep, prisoners yet unliberated, lost sons groping about for a Father's hand.

Make me a captive, Lord,
And then I shall be free;
Force me to render up my sword,
And I shall conqueror be.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Brass for Gold.

BY THE REVEREND E. L. ALLEN, KING'S COLLEGE, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

'And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem: and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house; he even took away all: and he took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made. And king Rehoboam made in their stead shields of brass, and committed them to the hands of the captains of the guard, which kept the door of the king's house. And it was so, that as oft as the king went into the house of the Lord, the guard bare them, and brought them back into the guard chamber.'—1K 14^{25-28} (R.V.).

As we read this story we cannot but feel a certain pity for Rehoboam, unworthy son of his father though he proved himself to be: evil days came upon him, and the best he could think of doing was to conceal the extent of the disaster. Those walls, stripped of their former splendour, seemed to cry out against him in constant reproach, but he found means of silencing them. He had shields of brass made to replace the shields of gold which had hung there in Solomon's day, and every time he went in state to the Temple he had them paraded before him in a solemn farce! Rehoboam organized his life around a sham; he had wasted his heritage, and he did his best to keep up the pretence that everything was as it had always been.

Perhaps before we condemn him we should do justice to the fact that pretence is not always wrong; there are indeed some circumstances in which we are prepared to praise it. No one, for example, would apply a strict moral judgment to the make-believe of children, and what is the theatre for the adult if it is not an invitation to go back to the days of 'Let's pretend'? If you are feeling unwell or have sustained a disappointment, you may consider it your duty to put a brave face on the matter and assure everybody that there is nothing wrong, just because you do not wish to distress them in any way. And does not our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount bid those who fast take elaborate precautions to conceal from their fellows that anything of the kind has been taking place?

But in a great many cases there is no such excuse available, and concealment of the facts is at best folly and at worst sin. How many people are reluctant to accept the limitations under which they live, and make themselves unhappy by trying to claim a social position they do not possess or powers they do not enjoy! How often does a young couple make shipwreck of marriage because of the preposterous attempt, with five pounds a week coming in, to make people believe that they have twice as much to play with! When these pretences invade the moral realm, the result is that hypocrisy so often denounced in the Gospels, the systematic concealment of one's real self, so that one appears fair outside even though one is foul within. This state of things is scathingly described by the analogy of a white-washed sepulchre, so imposing and pleasing in appearance, but in reality so repulsive.

In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare has described for us how a man is led by ambition to commit a fearful crime, and how he seeks by a course of dissimulation to conceal that crime, but cannot do it. It is not so much that his enemies suspect the truth and plot against him; Banquo's ghost rises to thrust him from the table, and in his own outraged conscience he has a deadly foe within.

We British folk are scornful of the East with its emphasis on 'saving face': but are we any better ourselves? How often one comes across a person who values the good opinion of his fellows so much that he would rather seek to retain it by falsehood than risk losing it by allowing the truth to be known! But peace of mind can be had at no lower price than that of facing the facts. Deliverance did not come to the prodigal till that moment when he looked back upon the whole course of his life till then and said: 'The unfilial son, the spendthrift, the waster—I am the man who has been that, but I will be so no more.' We must build our lives on the rock of reality; we have not in fact kept our honour if the world has been tricked into thinking us true men while in our heart of hearts we know that we are false.

In his play *The Pillars of Society* Ibsen introduces us to a highly respectable business man, a model of the domestic virtues as well as prosperous and rich. His fellow-townsmen come with banners to present him with a congratulatory address. They assemble in the garden and make speeches in his honour. His reply is an astounding one: for fifteen years, he declares, he has lived a lie in their midst, allowing an innocent man to suffer for a crime he committed, but now he must at all costs acknowledge the truth. The gathering

breaks up in confusion. When they two are alone again, he turns to his wife with the question: 'Can you ever forgive me?' And she replies: 'Thank God, at last I have you as you really are!' Yes, even at the human level, the frank acknowledgment that we are brass may be a better passport to the goodwill and esteem of our fellows than any effort to convince them that we are gold.

It is precisely here that the gospel of forgiveness meets us. It tells us that we need not struggle against the past, but that on the one condition of acknowledging it for exactly what it is, we can win from it by God's help a new life. Can we rewrite this old story and bring out what Rehoboam ought to have done in face of those bare walls which confronted him every day with his defeat and his disgrace? I can imagine him saying to himself: 'My father got the gold to make those shields by the taxation of his people, as he built his palace with their forced labour. So doing, he made his splendour detested by all, for it was based on the misery of Israel. With God's help I will seek to do better than that, I will leave my palace as it is, shorn of its former glory, till I have done all that is in my power for the happiness and welfare of my subjects. So perhaps, even though there will never again be gold here, my people will come to love these bare walls as they never did the magnificence of Solomon.'

The truth of God can reach us only as we ourselves are willing to be true; the forgiveness of God is only to be had as we arrive at the point where we are no longer willing to make excuses for ourselves. It was because the prodigal came to his father saying, 'I have sinned,' that the father could receive him; it was because the woman whom the Pharisees brought to Jesus had come to condemn herself utterly that He could bid her go in peace. 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' But 'if we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins.' The choice before us is the choice between the pride which cloaks what has been done and so increases its hold upon us and the sincerity which acknowledges it and so makes release from it possible. Where sin is not admitted, it eats away at the soul; where it has been faced and admitted, it can be forgiven and redeemed.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Holding Down the Truth in Unrighteousness.

BY THE REVEREND ERIC F. F. BISHOP, NEWMAN SCHOOL OF MISSIONS, THABOR, JERUSALEM.

'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness.'—Ro 1^{18}.

Probably the most interesting heretic of the early days of Christianity was a man called Marcion, the son of a bishop who hailed from Sinope on the southern shores of the Black Sea. Marcion was a well-to-do shipowner. Hence perhaps he was able to attract followers in different parts of the world. While his own palmy days were in the first half of the second century, it was three hundred years before his followers were roundly condemned at a Church Council.

Part of the trouble with Marcion in the eyes of Orthodoxy was that there was so much that was Christian in him—there very often is in heretics! For him the teaching of Jesus was one of 'faith and love,' and of ascetic practice, for the body has no share in salvation. The Son of God came down to suffer—for the sins of the whole world. Here was the strength of Marcion's position. But in justifying that position from the historical documents of Christianity he became a critic with a pen-knife. The Old Testament naturally went overboard first; but soon after he had to jettison parts of the New. In the gospel according to Marcion the Son of God suddenly came down from heaven in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar and started teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum—to talk about a God who was good without being righteous.

But the New Testament could not support Marcion. There is a 'wrath' of God, which, as human history past and present tends to prove, cannot merely be relegated to the limbo of an eschatology largely misunderstood and comfortably disregarded. 'A wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness.' That is St. Paul; but what about Jesus? Marcion has usefully forgotten Mark; for in that same synagogue in Capernaum there was a man with a withered hand; and men—the so-called righteous—watched their opportunity against Jesus, whether He would heal on the Sabbath Day, that they might accuse Him. And Jesus looked round about on them 'with anger,' being grieved at the obtuseness of their hearts. There it is in the earliest record of the Incarnate Jesus—not the Christ of apocalyptic imagery, but in the picture of Jesus as He was, and as men remembered Him—the Image of the Invisible God. Here is a record of the wrath of Jesus which has struggled to maintain its place in history. We know as well as any generation the factor of the love of God, which has always constituted the central note of the Christian evangel. But what Marcion did not see was that love does somehow turn to wrath when man grows wanton. What the wrath of God means is His denying Himself to those who deny themselves to Him. Even then they may have all He has to give, 'for wrath is not synonymous with hate where God is concerned.' It need not be with men. 'The wrath of God has to do with the sinner in the man'; the 'love of God applies to the man in the sinner.' There is a lot in me for God to be angry with; but please God there will come a time for us all, when there will be nothing left for God to be angry with; but is the converse true—that there can be those in whom there is nothing left for God to love?

But God's wrath, says St. Paul—and he says it

in the prophetical succession of the Hebrew seers from Amos to the Baptist and the Christ—God's wrath is being revealed against those who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. How smugly they listened to Amos two years before the earthquake!—as he went round the whole gamut of Israel's neighbours, Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab—the axis partners of those times—with Judah, rather like Rumania, thrown in too. But Amos was a prophet. 'For three transgressions of Israel, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have sold the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes; that pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek.' The 'sins of civilization' are the 'climax of a list of the atrocities of barbarism.' Amos criticised the foreign policy of the surrounding nations; but his fulminations against Israel were based on his familiarity with and experience of her domestic life.

'For three transgressions of' Germany, 'yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof,' because they have allowed the citadel of their national life to be rebuilt on a foundation of brute force and racial superiority; because they have dishonoured treaties and raped the lands that neighbour them; because like Edom before them, they have cast off all pity, and kept their wrath for generations; but I will send a 'blitz' upon Hamburg and it shall destroy the palaces of Cologne. Like Amos, we can criticise a disastrous foreign policy, which has issued 'in wanton war, massacre and sacrilege,' but we must turn to St. Paul and view the wrath of God revealed not only against the brute force that damns the world of His creation, but 'against all the impiety and wickedness of men.' It was not the power-politics of Israel that Amos primarily attacked but the rottenness inside. The wrath of Christ in the Capernaum synagogue was directed against a prejudice and an obstinacy as inhuman as anything of which Pilate might have been guilty. And as for ourselves, the judgment of God 'on our civilization is visible and terrible.' Where shall we begin, as we confront our own history over the last century? Because, while we have decried the crimes of other nations we have been content with a pleasant policy of *laissez faire*—often acquiescing all too easily in a racial discrimination which Christianity can never condone; or grudgingly admitting, when we had to, the unnecessary inequalities of our own class system. But had we not better start with the Church and her delinquencies? The prophets oftentimes began at Bethel—with the house of God. What of the Church with her too facile acceptance of a *status quo*—the practical agreement at times to be just a department of State; the spirit of worldliness, the naïve assumption of ecclesiastical superiority, the comparative unconcern to heal the sores created by a divided Christendom, the too tight hold on dogmas that can hardly stand the strain of history—much less of the demands of modern life; or, from a somewhat different angle of approach, the fallacious tendency to the all too glib assumption that 'all religions are equally true' and 'equally ineffective,' found even among those who would profess and call themselves Christian. St. Paul and Amos both claim that it is on moral issues that any civilization's fate depends; and our civilization will need more than the Atlantic Charter to put it right; or even the one on the Black Sea opposite Marcion's old home. If the God revealed in Jesus Christ on Calvary be the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, our civilization can hardly expect to escape the revelation of His wrath. And here is the indictment that we must ponder and pray over, written half a century ago by George Adam Smith: 'It will scarcely be denied that our civilization tolerates and lives by the existence of vices which, as we all admit, ruined the ancient empires. Are the political possibilities of overthrow also present? That there exist among us means of new historic convulsions is a thing hard for us to admit. But the signs cannot be hid. When we see the jealousies of the Christian peoples, and their enormous preparations for battle; the arsenals of Europe, which a few sparks may blow up; the millions of soldiers one man's word may mobilize; when we imagine the opportunities which a general war would furnish to the discontented masses of the European proletariat—we must surely acknowledge the existence of forces capable of inflicting calamities so severe as to affect not merely this nationality or that type of culture, but the very vigour and progress of civilization itself; and all this without our looking beyond Christendom, or taking into account the rise of the yellow races to a consciousness of their approach to equality with ourselves. If then in the eyes of divine justice Christendom merits judgment—if life continue to be so hard for the poor; if innocence be still an impossibility for so much of the childhood of the Christian nations; if with so many of the leaders of civilization prurience be lifted to the level of an art and licentiousness be followed as a cult; if we continue to pour the evils of our civilization upon the barbarian, and "the vices of our young nobles are aped in Hindustan,"—then let us know that the means of judgment more awful than any which has yet scourged a delinquent civilization are extant and actual among us. And if any one should reply that our Christianity makes all the difference—that God cannot undo the development of nineteen centuries, or cannot overthrow the Kingdom of His Son—then let us know that God does justice at whatever cost.'

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sympathetic Knowledge.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.'—Ex 23^{9}.

In the first chapter of his famous book, *The Jesus of History*, the late Dr. T. R. Glover tells of

a conversation he had with a young working man upon whose visionary schemes of social reorganization he poured the cold water of middle-aged and middle-class common sense. 'And then,' says Dr. Glover, 'he began to talk of hunger—the hunger that haunted whole streets in our city, where they had indeed something to eat every day, but never quite enough, and the children grew up so—the hunger that he had experienced himself, for I knew his story. With his eyes fixed on me, he brought home to me by the quiet intensity of his speech—whether he knew what he effected or not—that he and I gave hunger different senses. He gave the word for me a new meaning, with the glimpse he gave me of his experience.' Thus Dr. Glover, following by an effort of imaginative sympathy the emotions revealed partly in the young man's words and partly in his aspect and manner of speaking, attained to a new knowledge on the matter of hunger. In terms of our text, he came to know the heart of a hungry man. That one should be able thus to share experience with another is indeed a blessed and enriching thing, albeit mysterious and wonderful too. We are apt to think of one another as hard compact individuals with merely external contacts, rubbing against one another in life like marbles in a boy's pocket. So far as that image describes our contacts we are falling away from our high calling as human beings, let alone as sons of God. For good or ill we are social beings and can share our experiences. Given a certain patience and a freedom from self-absorption we can learn to feel with others and so to increase this sympathetic knowledge, becoming more and more 'baptized into a sense of all conditions.' On the other hand, lack of sympathetic knowledge embitters controversy, spoils charity, and often makes even sympathy so-called a thing to be resented. 'If your soul were in my soul's stead,' says Job to his 'miserable comforters'; and his words may well serve as a warning against handling other personalities with coarsened fingers, against daring to get close to people without first trying, by an effort of imaginative sympathy, to put oneself in their place and learn to put their value, and not one's own, upon their words and deeds.

1. **Sympathetic knowledge is rooted in personal experience.** 'Ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.' Dr. Glover came to know what hunger meant to a poor man without himself having been through it; but he could hardly have done so without that modified experience of hunger which comes every day to those who live a healthy and active life. A measure of common experience is necessary to make sympathetic knowledge possible. A friend once remarked to me—'What! So-and-so write a commentary on the *Book of Job*,—a man who never had a day's illness in his life.' There are certainly other troubles than illness, and illness was by no means the worst of Job's troubles; yet the criticism was shrewd.

No doubt in this matter of sympathetic knowledge a mere identity of experience is less important than the possession of what Bagehot called 'an experiencing mind'; but identity or similarity of experience should help to produce sympathetic knowledge in those who are not naturally equipped with experiencing minds. 'Ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.' If the Israelites to whom these words were addressed had not themselves served in Egypt, at any rate they had the experience of their fathers vividly present with them in their traditions. There was sufficient similarity between the position of the Israelites in Egypt and that of an alien in later Israel to make sympathetic knowledge certain. In like manner we may not have had serious illness, but we all know what it is to be sick, and on the basis of it we can surely attain, if we care, to a sympathetic knowledge of what many of our brethren have to suffer. So indeed it is with many other aspects of human experience—pain, loneliness, weariness, hope deferred, bereavement.

2. **Sympathetic knowledge is for practical guidance in the conduct of life.** 'Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger.' The humane outlook of Israel's law is evident here. Too often in the ancient world the alien was regarded as an enemy without even a vestige of human rights; but not so in Israel, for Israel's God cared for the alien, too. Moreover, it is worth noticing that here is no imperious command with dire threatenings of penalty, but a reasoned appeal to Israel's own experience and natural feelings. That also is characteristic of Israel's God. 'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord.' The appeal, however, is pointed and necessary, for it is quite possible to acquire the knowledge that is born of similarity of experience and to refrain from acting upon it. It is notorious how often men who have risen from lowly station are more overbearing toward their subordinates than those who have been born to command. Sympathetic knowledge is for our guidance into the ways of considerateness and humanity. Its issue is a deed, not a feeling; it aims not at brotherly sentiment but at practical brotherliness. 'Thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger.' Observe, too, the same movement of mind, only universalized and turned from the negative to the positive, in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount—'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.'

3. **Sympathetic knowledge is rooted in the nature of God.** The Psalmist finds comfort and inspiration in the thought that God, though so high and lifted up, yet partakes of this sympathetic knowledge, 'for he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust.' Moreover the Scriptures assure us that this sympathetic knowledge, like our own, is partly the fruit of experience. It is in the great doctrine of the high priesthood of our Lord as expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews that this comes to emphatic expression. At the end of the second chapter the author declares that Jesus had in all things to be made like unto His

brethren that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest. Even more clearly at the end of chapter four the author anticipates a possible objection to the effect that Jesus, our high priest, is and was a heavenly being, a being of another order than we, one who might perhaps look on our trials with sympathy of a condescending kind, but not with the sympathy born of experience. Not so, declares the writer to the Hebrews in passionate tones. The Incarnation was no pretence; the virtue of the days of His flesh is carried forward into His risen life; our high priest is also our captain and pioneer, who asks us to plunge to no depth of temptation or suffering deeper than He has Himself sounded. 'For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.'

There is, then, sympathetic knowledge in the heart of the Eternal.

O Saviour Christ, Thou too art Man;
Thou hast been troubled, tempted, tried.

Such sympathetic knowledge as we know among men is but the welling up in human hearts of something that is for ever in the heart of God. How close we are here to the springs of Christian comfort, as again and again we are driven by the bitterness of life to cry, 'O Saviour Christ, have mercy upon us and succour us, strangers and sojourners upon earth; for Thou knowest the heart of a stranger, seeing Thou too wast a stranger in this land of Egypt.'

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Eternal Struggle.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., Rhu.

'There is no discharge in that war.'—Ec 8^{8}.

The war in Europe is over. The countries which had been occupied by the enemy are rejoicing in their liberty. Very many of our fighting forces will presently be returning home and will receive an honourable discharge.

In contrast to all that, the wise man speaks in this text of a war from which there is no discharge. We know quite well to what he refers. It is to the battle of life which goes on unceasingly and from which there is no signing off. It is a far-reaching commitment in which there can be no evading of our moral responsibilities. We may get our well-earned 'leaves,' so to speak, but there can be no 'discharge from the service' in this unending campaign. There can be no moratorium in this vast moral and spiritual enterprise in which we must continually 'pay.' In the struggle which goes on between good and evil, between the malignant forces of the world and the heavenly redeeming love of God, there can be no respite and no neutrality.

1. There is a warfare from which no **nation** is ever free. To speak in terms of a nation is not, of course, to forget that a nation is composed of individuals, and that if we are to have a nation regenerated through suffering, it will only come about if there are multitudes of individuals who have become new men and women. This is our most pressing need. How is this to come about?

One great hope is that the mistakes we made after the last war may illuminate our minds and correct our judgments and chasten our spirits.

In 1921, two years after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, a truly prophetic book appeared with the title *Disenchantment*. It was written by C. E. Montague, a distinguished journalist and a combatant during 1914–18. In this small book, marked by a shrewd and incisive analysis of the national mood, Montague pointed out very frankly and unsparingly the perils which encompassed us. Victory was not enough. The time had arrived, he declared, when we must give all the strength we had left to the job of regaining the old control of ourselves and our fate. We had to give up pretence, for every one knew inside him that he had 'to go home afterwards and get down to the housework of straight living, whether he knew how to find it exciting and jolly or not.'

We know now how to our everlasting loss the warnings of Montague were ignored. Now we realize that we are being given a second chance, and that victory in the field is barely a beginning. In the light of all that remains to be done, of all our responsibilities to other nations, and of our paramount duty to build our national life on a truer and sounder basis, spiritual reconstruction must now be our great aim. We stand in the valley of decision, and the future of the coming centuries depends to a very large extent on what will happen in the next few years of crisis. We shall be victorious or worsted in what may be a more subtle struggle against the forces of human degeneration and regression everywhere, a struggle of which our crushing of the Nazi attempt to enslave the British people is itself only a fragment. No magic wand, no pact nor legislation will waft us mechanically into a kingdom of plenty and prosperity. It is only through a holy resolve and the spirit of a crusade that we shall make good.

2. Look also at the **individual** implications of this stern summons to an arduous moral campaign. When our Lord referred to it, He used the word 'Agonize.' Certainly no easy road will bring us to our goal. When people were discussing the wonderful possibilities that might materialize after the last war and trying to solve the gigantic problems of the new day that seemed then about to dawn, Principal Denney rose in a hushed Assembly and uttered this timely warning: 'Human nature,' he said, 'will be the same. The Law of God will be the same. The inconsistencies of a being conscious of a spiritual calling, but with roots descending into the dark places of nature will be the same. Man's glory and shame, his hope and his despair, his pride and his need of God will be the same.' Yes, we have to reckon with the same mysterious mixture of good and evil within us, the same conflict and contradictions in human nature in 1945 as in 1918.

Here again it is fatally easy for the individual to take the line of least resistance. It is said that 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.' This is true also of our inner warfare against all indwelling evil. We cannot afford to parley or fraternize. One illustration will suffice. Some time ago I 'listened-in' to that powerful lay sermon, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. It was a dramatic rendering of R. L. Stevenson's famous allegory. Dr. Jekyll was a popular West End physician. Gradually, however, he became tired of the humdrum life of a fashionable doctor. He had been a keen student of drugs and their effects. One day he discovered after experiments that by taking a certain mixture, he could transform himself into a creature capable of all manner of vice and cruelty, and yet get back again after the wildest debauch to his 'respectable' self. But one day he discovered to his horror that it was with the greatest difficulty that he effected the change back, coming out of the guise of the sinister monster who was Hyde to the benevolent and well-loved doctor. Then, at last, the power of the drug utterly failed and he was revealed as 'Mr. Hyde,' an abominable and hideous caricature of humanity.

It is an allegory, and as one listened to his cries of torture and mental agony, one realized the poignant truth of these words of the Apostle: 'The good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.' Yet had Dr. Jekyll only confided in his friend Utterson, he might have been saved. When St. Paul found himself involved in that tremendous moral struggle which is common to us all, he attained to victory and deliverance by means of a great alliance with an all-powerful Friend. It was the friendship of Jesus Christ which reinforced and saved his better self. There is no other effectual way out.

This is the Christian's Holy War. It lasts as long as life itself. This is the 'good fight,' and it demands the superb courage which faints not nor fails. The struggle with the Nazi is over. There is only the struggle with oneself. That is the hardest of all. But, thank God, we can reckon on the same Divine Alliance which will enable us to be 'more than conquerors.' This does not mean for any one the end of warfare or the cessation of all struggle. As F. W. H. Myers wrote:

Let no man think that sudden in a minute
All is accomplished and the work is done;
Though with thine earliest dawn thou shouldst begin it
Scarce were it ended in thy setting sun.

At the same time it does mean that victory is assured. 'Sin shall not have dominion over you' is a promise which does not deceive us. When Christ conquers in a man, He leads that man in triumph. The lives of countless souls abound in convincing proof of the truth of this great and heartening declaration:

Witness the men whom with a word He gaineth,
Bold who were base and voiceful who were dumb:
Battle, I know, so long as life remaineth,
Battle for all, but these have overcome.

The Just.

By Father Lev Gillet, London.

The 'Just One' or the 'Righteous One' is a title given several times to Jesus in the New Testament. It is, according to a recent commentator,[1] 'perhaps the oldest title given to Jesus.'

When Pilate was sitting on his judgment-seat his wife sent to him, saying: 'Have nothing to do with that righteous man' (Mt 27^{19}). Pilate himself, washing his hands before the multitude, said, 'I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man' (Mt 27^{24}). The centurion who watched the death of Jesus proclaimed: 'Certainly this was a righteous man' (Lk 23^{47}). This last sentence is very remarkable, as being Luke's version of 'Truly this man was the Son of God' in Mark.

In the Book of Acts 'Just' becomes a kind of technical term applied to our Lord: Jesus is no more *a* righteous man, but *the* Righteous and *the* Just. Peter tells the people: 'Ye have denied the Holy and the Righteous One' (3^{14}). Stephen reminds the Jews that their fathers killed the prophets 'which shewed before the coming of the Righteous One' (7^{52}). Ananias says to Saul: 'The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One' (22^{14}).

James writes in his Epistle (5^{6}): 'Ye have condemned, ye have killed the righteous one.' Now there is perhaps more in James' words than it seems at first sight. James was 'the brother of the Lord'; he himself was called 'the Just.' The title may have passed on from Jesus to James, though with a different meaning.

Peter writes (1 P 3^{18}), 'Christ suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous.' John

[1] *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (1933), iv. 104.

dwells on this subject: 'We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. . . . If ye know that he is righteous. . . . Even as he is righteous . . .' (1 Jn $2^{1.29}$ and 3^{7}).

What does the title 'Just' or 'Righteous' mean, when applied to Jesus? Noah, Joseph the husband of Mary, Joseph of Arimathea, Cornelius the centurion are called 'just' in the Scriptures. There is the 'righteous' of the Psalms and prophetic writings. There is the righteousness described by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. There is the just according to Paul, who 'shall live by faith.' Above all, righteousness is also a biblical attribute of God Himself. As one sees, the term stands for very different ideas. A short survey of its evolution may help us better to realize in what manner Christ is the Just.

The Hebrew word *tsedek*, from which are derived all the technical terms meaning right or righteousness, occurs over five hundred times in the Old Testament. It generally denotes what is true and right and rests ultimately on the physical analogy of straightness (*e.g.* just balances and weights). In common speech it had a strong nomistic and forensic aspect: to be in the right, to declare the right, to do things as justice demands. The teaching of the Prophets marked an advance on this current notion of righteousness and elevated it to a higher plane: the Prophets are concerned with social and ethical (as opposed to ceremonial) justice, they proclaim it with a tremendous emphasis, but they are not dependent on a written code or the technicalities of law. By right and justice they mean not only the impartial attitude of mind, the fair decision, but a real readiness to protect and succour. The idea of justification begins to be mingled with the idea of salvation. Sentence becomes deliverance. Here we have a most important turning-point in the history of the Jewish idea of justice. The oppressed are *ipso facto* 'in the right' against the oppressors. The righteous of the Psalms is a merciful man, willing to lend and to give. To be righteous is to be generous. In God Himself holiness, judicial uprightness, that righteousness which had formerly meant self-consistency, is more and more acknowledged to imply a redemptive purpose going far beyond the universal moral order of the world.

We are summarizing a long history.[1] But it is beyond doubt that, in the times of Jesus, the Jewish expression 'justice' or 'righteousness' had undergone an extraordinary change of meaning. Far from remaining a strictly judicial attribute, justice had become a consideration which moderated the operation of strict judgment. Nay, justice and formal right proved more and more to be incompatible. *Tsedakah*, 'righteousness,' was being blended with *hesed*, 'grace, kindness, love.' We find a valuable echo of this transformation in the Septuagint where *tsedakah* is not infrequently translated, not by its Greek equivalent *dikaiosyne*, but by *eleos*, 'mercy,' or *eleemosyne*, 'alms.' These facts indicate a strong tendency to amalgamate justice and love.

Early rabbinic thought went still further than the Old Testament in that direction. It was said that a judge exercises 'righteousness' when he pays out of his own pocket the fine he has imposed on a poor man.[2] According to a rabbinical maxim, 'where justice is there is no judgment.'[3] The *Zohar*—this great Jewish mystical treatise of the Middle Ages—has repeatedly elaborated the same theme: 'Come and see what God does on behalf of the righteous, for although punishment is divinely decreed upon the world, it is held back for their sake and does not come. . . . The righteous are the foundation and mainstay of the world. . . . They create peace in heaven and peace on earth and they unite the bridegroom to the bride. . . . They draw goodness down from above in order to do good to us and to all the universe.'[4]

This trend of ideas (so far from the narrow legalism often and mistakenly attributed to Judaism) came to a climax in Hasidism, the great mystical movement which arose among the Jewish masses in the eighteenth century. Hasidism emphasizes the importance of the *tsadik* or 'righteous one.' Each Hasidic community has a *tsadik* as its spiritual head. But there is nothing legalistic about him. The ecstatic prayers of the *tsadik*, his mystical (not legal) righteousness enable him to become a sort of mediator between God and men and, in some way, to bring heaven down to earth. This conception of the 'Just' might easily become a bridge between Hasidism and Christianity.

The deep Jewish transformation of the idea of justice had prepared the way for the New Testament *dikaios* or 'just.' His righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes, as the spiritual content exceeds the outer form. Christian 'justice,' far from being a forensic act, is an inner renewal and a gift. It has its roots in the free condescension of God.

[1] See the articles on 'Righteousness,' by J. Skinner and G. B. Stevens in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv., and by A. R. Gordon, J. Denney, A. F. Simpson, J. Abelson in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, x. The most valuable treatise on the subject is G. Dalman, *Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im A.T.* (1897).

[2] Dalman, *op. cit.*, 5. [3] *Ib.*, 6.
[4] *Zohar*. On Gn 41^{1} and 41^{14}.

Christ is the only true and perfect Righteous, *the* Just One. He is the Jewish *tsadik* in the fullest sense by His mediatory and saving power, by the predominance which He gives to mercy over judgment. He is the Just, not because He identified Himself with the Law, but, as the Jewish tradition had dimly foreseen, because He is greater than any law.

There exists no Old Testament evidence that 'the Just One' was a Jewish synonym for the Messiah. The pseudepigraphical literature contains, however, a trace of this idea: in Enoch 38[2] the author of that section uses 'the Righteous' among other Messianic titles. We may conclude therefrom that, 'between the two Testaments,' Jewish thought had more or less associated the notions of Just and Messiah and thus prepared the way for the affirmations of the Book of Acts.

Jewish thought had also approached the idea of the suffering of the Righteous. This idea is developed in the second and third chapters of the Book of Wisdom. There are some passages which remind us so strikingly of Isaiah 53 on the Suffering Servant that we must quote them at some length:

'Let us oppress the poor righteous man. . . . Let us lie in wait for the righteous. . . . He professeth to have the knowledge of God, and he calleth himself the child of the Lord. He was made to reprove our thoughts. He is grievous unto us even to behold; for his life is not like other men's, his ways are of another fashion. . . . He boasteth that God is his Father. Let us see whether his words be true and let us prove what shall happen in the end of him. For, if the just be the son of God, He will help him and deliver him from the hands of his enemies. Let us examine him with contempt and torture, that we may know his meekness and try his patience. Let us condemn him with a shameful death: for by his own sayings he shall be respected. . . . But the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, and their departure is taken for misery . . . but they are in peace. . . . As gold in the furnace He (God) hath tried them, and received them as a burnt offering' (Wis $2^{10.\ 12-20}$ $3^{1-3.\ 6}$).

The coincidences of thought and expression, not only with Isaiah but with some passages of the New Testament itself, are here so close that some ancient scholars (Grotius, Noack) considered these chapters of Wisdom as being of Christian origin. It is probable that the writer, when he spoke of the 'just man,' simply meant the faithful Israelite and had perhaps in mind the barbarities inflicted on Eleazar and others in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (see 2 Mac 6^{8-31}). But, from a spiritual point of view, Barnabas, Justin, Origen, Hippolytus, Eusebius among the Greek Fathers and writers, and Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustine among the Latins, were right in treating these passages as a direct prophecy of Christ's Passion.

The Talmud develops ideas analogous to those of the Book of Wisdom about the sufferings of the Just: 'The righteous, even when dead, are called living.[1] . . . They are like lost pearls of great price. . . . They are not really lost because they exist somewhere, and in all their original preciousness and beauty.'[2]

The Hellenic world had been providentially prepared for the coming and for the understanding of the Just One.[3] In Aeschylus Justice, *Diké*, is the daughter of Zeus. In Sophocles she is the assessor of his throne. One remembers the famous passage in which Antigone appeals to the unwritten Law and to the Justice which dwells with the gods, against the unrighteous decrees of Creon.[4] And above all there is the well-known passage from Plato, which no Christian could ever read without emotion:

'So we must strip him (the Just) bare of everything, but justice. . . . Though doing no wrong he must have the repute of the greatest injustice. . . . Such being his disposition, the just man will be scourged, racked, bound; he will have his eyes burnt; and, at last, after every extremity of suffering, he will be crucified. . . .'[5]

[1] T. B. *Berakoth*, 18a. [2] T. B. *Megillah*, 15a.
[3] See Kenneth, Adam and Gwatkin, *Early Ideals of Righteousness: Hebrew, Greek and Roman* (1910); J. E. Harrison, *Themis* (1912).
[4] *Antig.*, 854. [5] *Republic*, ii. 4, 5.

Contributions and Comments.

Galatians v. 23.

An Explanation.

In Act III. of *The Tempest*, six words, 'Most busy lest, when I do it,' have engendered a greater amount of comment, criticism, and suggested emendation than perhaps any other passage in Shakespeare's works. In the Furness Edition no less than twelve full pages are devoted to the subject. One of the commentators, however, who appears to have been endowed with a larger

share of common sense than the others, thinks that all that is required is to print a dash after the word 'it,' as the sentence was never finished. Ferdinand's words died away on his lips when he beheld the beauty of the approaching Miranda. This text in Galatians may be said to resemble the passage in *The Tempest* as it has received a great deal of attention from critics, and a great deal of learning has been expended to find out, and to explain, why St. Paul confidently asserted that certain virtues were above all law. It is also similar because a slight alteration in the printing is all that is necessary in the way of explanation, and the words 'against such there is no law' should be placed between inverted commas in our Bibles. They are, in fact, a quotation from a famous passage in Aristotle. The Philosopher in *The Politics* has a great deal to say about the State and the people who compose it. In Book III, ch. 8, he considers the position of men of outstanding virtue and attainments, and he argues that legislation, being necessarily concerned with persons who are equal in birth and ability, cannot apply to such, who are themselves a law, and it would be ridiculous to try to legislate for them. He sums up his argument in the striking phrase 'but against such there is no law,' *κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος.*

When St. Paul was dictating his Epistle to the Galatians, and he came to speak of the fruit of the spirit, as the names of the virtues fell from his tongue, he was searching his mind for some striking and comprehensive phrase that would explain how pre-eminent they were, and subconsciously he recalled some words of Aristotle's that he had heard years before, and his scribe heard him declaim 'against such there is no law,' *κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.*

It may be objected that a great writer would not insert a quotation, like this, into a passage where it might interrupt the sense, but it should be remembered that St. Paul was apt to do this. Those stirring words in Romans beginning 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ'? have a quotation put into them from the Psalms, and although this may have produced an effect upon the readers of those days which we are not able to appreciate fully in these times, it must be admitted that the quotation comes in rather awkwardly. As a further proof that St. Paul had, at some period or other, studied this portion of *The Politics* of Aristotle, it may be pointed out that the Philosopher regards men of super-eminence as being themselves a law, an idea that seems to be echoed in Ro 2^{14}.

J. D. ROBB.

Belfast.

Philippians ii. 7.

THE theory of *kenosis* propounded by certain theologians of the mid-nineteenth century to explain the incarnation stated that in becoming man the Son of God emptied Himself of certain divine attributes, omnipotence, omniscience, and the like, and then the rest became man. This theory has been criticised from many points of view, but has the fundamental criticism been urged against it that such a proceeding could not rightly be called *emptying*? For *κενός* means 'empty,' 'void of content.' This would render *ἐκένωσεν* inappropriate when part of the contents were left, which is what is assumed in this interpretation.

Again, emptying has two sides. The negative, most definitely expressed by the word, is that what was full now has nothing left in it. But there is also the positive. The contents are now elsewhere, possibly on the ground and so lost, but also, as possibly, now contained in some other vessel. Is it not possible that it was this last meaning that was in the Apostle's mind? I think so, for there is a parallel between *ἐνμορφῇ Θεοῦ* and *μορφὴν δοῦλου.* The form of God had lost its contents, which were now transferred to the form of a slave. If I am right, St. Paul did not by these words intend to state that in becoming man our Lord had left something of Himself behind, but rather to emphasize the completeness of the incarnation. It may be objected that then he ought to have written *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν εἰς μορφὴν δουλου.* The answer is that he often tries to pack into one phrase matter that really requires two to express it. I assume that here he wanted both to say that the Son of God emptied Himself from the God-form into the man-form and in the same phrase to lay emphasis on the fact that He took (selected) a form in human estimation most debased, that of a slave. No doubt our Lord's words in Mk $10^{44.\ 45}$ were in his mind.

If this interpretation of St. Paul is right it looks as if the criticisms of your reviewer of Canon Baker's *Prophets for a Day of Judgment* need reconsidering. For the Apostle means here that the whole Son of God was given to men in the incarnation. But omnipotence in the ordinary acceptation of the term was not a possession of Christ on earth. But if that is an essential attribute of God then the whole of the second person of the Trinity was not emptied into the form of a servant. Whereas if, as Canon Baker asserts, the omnipotence of God is love, that omnipotence became incarnate in Christ and is *the* power of God to salvation. This position was ably maintained by Canon C. E. Rolt thirty years ago in *The World's Redemption.* Something very like it is written in the second century Epistle to Diognetus, in which the emphatic statement is made *βία οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ Θεῷ.*

W. E. WILSON.

Natland, Kendal.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.